

SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 23, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KERN presented resolutions adopted by Group 5, Indiana Bankers' Association, indorsing the plan for monetary legislation as suggested by the National Monetary Commission, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 123, Patrons of Husbandry, of New Hampton, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a memorial of the Green River Valley Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, of Wyoming, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Lander, Wyo., remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented an affidavit in support of the bill (S. 1167) granting an increase of pension to Elias Shaffer, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Miami, Fla., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of West Thornton Grange, No. 253, Patrons of Husbandry, of New Hampshire, and a memorial of New Hampton Grange, No. 123, Patrons of Husbandry, of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BROWN presented a petition of the Real Estate Exchange of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Nebr., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Johnston Sunday-rest bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented affidavits in support of the bill (S. 2177) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Bell, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

COLORADO AVENUE AND KENNEDY STREET NW.

Mr. CURTIS. I report back favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, the bill (H. R. 8649) to authorize the extension and the widening of Colorado Avenue NW., from Longfellow Street to Sixteenth Street, and of Kennedy Street NW., through lot No. 800, square No. 2718, and I submit a report (No. 86) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CURTIS. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1334) to authorize the extension and widening of Colorado Avenue NW., from Longfellow Street to Sixteenth Street, and of Kennedy Street NW., through lot No. 800, square No. 2718, to submit an adverse report (No. 87) thereon, and I ask that the bill be postponed indefinitely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be postponed indefinitely.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 2865) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Ward (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 2866) for adjudication and determination of the rights and equities of the widow and family of Marcus P. Norton and the heirs at law, assigns, legatees, or legal representatives of others; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 2867) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Tracy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 2868) granting a pension to Annie S. Diamond (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2869) granting an increase of pension to Daniel D. Whitney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2870) to regulate the importation and interstate transportation of nursery stock, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests, to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2871) for the relief of the heirs of William Weeks; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2872) to require dealers in meats, fruits, and vegetables in the District of Columbia to protect the same from flies, insects, and dust; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RATES OF POSTAGE (S. DOC. NO. 54).

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which I send to the desk. It is very brief, and I ask to have the Secretary read it for the information of the Senate.

The bill (S. 2873) fixing the rate of postage to be charged for the transmission of mail within the United States or its possessions was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act no higher postage rate shall be charged for the transmission of mail entirely within the United States or its possessions than is charged for transmission of mail partly within and partly without the United States or its possessions. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and required to establish and enforce rules and regulations which will give the people of the United States rights and privileges in the use of the United States mails as liberal as the rights and privileges the United States accords to the people of the most favored nation.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, it may seem strange to Members of the Senate that there should be a possibility of legislation giving American citizens privileges in the United States mails between themselves equal with those enjoyed by residents of this country in transaction of business with residents of foreign countries. The facts are these: Within the United States the rate of postage on fourth-class matter is 16 cents a pound, with a limit of 4 pounds. The United States is party to a treaty under which residents of 29 foreign countries may send fourth-class matter through the United States mails at 12 cents a pound, with a limit of 11 pounds. In other words, a man may send an 11-pound package from San Francisco to Rome, Italy, at 12 cents a pound, but if he wishes to send the same articles to New York he must divide them into packages of not to exceed 4 pounds each and pay 16 cents a pound. A Japanese residing in New York can send an 11-pound package to his friends in Tokyo at 12 cents, but an American in New York can send only a 4-pound package from New York to Washington and must pay 16 cents a pound.

Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of both Senate and House have under consideration bills for the establishment of parcels post. In my opinion the specific provisions of such a bill should be fixed only after the most careful investigation. I believe Congress will establish a parcels-post rate at less than 12 cents a pound and a rate very much less than that for short hauls. But whatever the ultimate action on the question of parcels post, I see no reason for delay in the enactment of this law giving American citizens as favorable postal facilities as this Government extends to residents of foreign countries. Especially is this true when investigation by the Post Office Department shows that the cost of transporting fourth-class matter is approximately 12 cents a pound. The passage of this bill will in no way conflict with any subsequent legislation on the subject of parcels post.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], coupled with the statement he has made,

is going to call for a great deal of correspondence upon this subject, and it occurred to me that it would facilitate our correspondence if the remarks of the Senator from Oregon could be printed as a Senate document, so that we could have them to inclose in response to inquiries for this kind of data. I therefore make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE], just made, be printed as a Senate document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire to have the bill printed likewise?

Mr. CLAPP. I am not so particular about that. A very brief statement of the bill would be carried, of course, by the press, and the carrying of the statement of the bill by the press would make calls for the correspondence.

LAND IN FULTON COUNTY, GA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. BACON. I ask permission of the Senate for the consideration, by unanimous consent, of the bill (S. 2462) to cede jurisdiction to the State of Georgia over certain land in Fulton County. It will take but a moment. It is a matter of some importance to my State.

The Secretary read the bill, and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF RURAL DELIVERY ROADS.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will lay before the Senate bill 2846, upon which the Senator from North Carolina has given notice he will address the Senate this morning.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2846) for experimental improvement of rural delivery roads by the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Postmaster General, for investigating the subject of Federal registration and license of automobiles used in interstate travel, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the industries of the country may be classified into agricultural, manufacturing, and transportation.

All of these industries are of great importance, but as agriculture provides food for the people, markets for manufactures, and business to transportation, it is entitled to preeminence as being our basic industry.

During the colonial period of our existence and for many years after the revolution, agriculture was the chief, almost the sole, occupation of our people. We had no manufacturing, and our only means of transportation was by water and the ordinary wagon road.

In these conditions the necessity of diversifying the pursuits of the people, of supplying their needs for manufactures, and providing more efficient transportation for the distribution of their products became a subject of grave consideration.

How were these desirable and necessary results to be brought about? On account of the general poverty of the people it was manifest that individual resource and effort were wholly inadequate to meet the demand. The situation suggested inquiry into the duty and powers of the Government in the premises and led to an exhaustive discussion by leaders of thought in those early days of every phase of the question, resulting in the adoption by the Government of a policy which has continued to the present day.

From that time to this the Government has sought by legislation and otherwise to encourage and foster the industries of the people by supplementing individual effort with pecuniary aid.

Before the era of railroads ambitious projects for public highways were devised and entered upon, and millions were contributed from the Public Treasury and domain for their construction, while great schemes were projected and worked out for the improvement of rivers and harbors and for connecting the waterways of the country by artificial canals.

However, it was not until after the Civil War that the Government entered upon that broad, comprehensive, and liberal system of Government cooperation and aid which has led to such marvelous results in the development of manufacturing and transportation. While every tariff act since the formation of the Government in 1789 has given assistance to the upbuilding of manufactures, the legislation of the last 50 years has been of surpassing liberality, and the aggregate contributions of the people during that period to this end have been stupendous.

As a result, this industry has in an incredibly short time, starting from practically nothing, developed into a system unequalled in magnitude and in efficiency of operation by that of any other nation upon the earth.

The same policy has been pursued with reference to rail-and-water transportation. The contributions of the National Government to railroads in land grants and otherwise, and of the States, counties, townships, cities, and towns, through stock and bond subscriptions, reach into billions. The land grants alone contributed by the Government aggregate nearly 200,000,000 acres.

So, likewise, with reference to our waterway transportation. Wherever it has been shown that commerce would be benefited by the improvement of our rivers and harbors, the Government has not withheld such amounts as seemed reasonably necessary to provide for the transportation needs of the community affected. Millions upon millions are being expended for this purpose year by year, with ever-increasing liberality, and the time is not far distant when by reason of these contributions of the people every harbor and every navigable stream will have such facilities and depth as may be needed to accommodate its present and prospective commerce. Not only this, but the great water systems of the country will be linked together by artificial channels, and, at an expense to the Government which would a few years ago have appalled the world, the two great oceans which bound our continent on the east and west will be connected by a channel dug through mountains and of sufficient depth to accommodate the deepest draft vessels of the world.

I do not mean, of course, to underestimate the important part played by private capital and energy in advancing our transportation and manufacturing to their present state of efficiency and completeness, nor do I doubt that this result would have been accomplished through individual effort in the course of time, but without this pecuniary aid of the people, acting through their Governments, National and State, the progress to this end would have been comparatively slow and the consummation long delayed.

What has the Government done to foster and promote agriculture—that industry on which our very existence depends, which has done its part in building up the country, which has indeed made possible the growth of manufactures, the construction of our transportation lines, the rapid development of our banking and stock interests, and without which our cities and towns would at once fall into decay and ruin; an industry that creates wealth not only for itself but for all other industries, which occupies nearly 40 per cent of our population, whose exertions convert the elements of nature into commodities that have an annual value of \$9,000,000,000?

It is true there are some branches of agriculture that have heretofore participated in the bounties of the tariff, but it is now sought and proposed to take from the farmer all direct participation in these supposed benefactions.

It is true that something has been done in recent years to aid in teaching scientific agriculture and better cultural methods, but the amount contributed for this purpose, though something, is small when compared with other Government contributions to national objects of far less importance.

It is also true that the farmer's demand for improved mail facilities has to some extent been granted, but the amount expended to this end is no greater than that expended for city delivery, and is only a tardy recognition of a constitutional right, and is far below what the farmer needs and should have. Not only this, but the installation and expansion of the rural delivery has been impeded by many hindrances and obstacles, and in its administration there are and have been manifest discriminations. The officials employed to serve him are discriminated against, in salary, in the hours of labor, and in the matter of equipment needed to discharge their duty.

After years of struggle the service has been extended until now it reaches something like two-thirds of our rural population, but the service rendered is meager compared with what it should be and what is needed and demanded, and could be given with but slight increase in cost.

The service is so admirably adapted to accommodating cheap and quick parcels delivery that it actually suggests the installation of this additional service, not only as a revenue measure but as a matter of local convenience and saving, on the one hand, and as extending to the dwellers in the country, through the mails, at least the same advantages enjoyed in the city through the medium of the express companies.

Five or six years ago I introduced in committee an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill providing for a rural parcels post. It was adopted by the committee and the Senate, but was stricken out in conference.

That the farmer has received so little aid and encouragement from the Government is probably ascribable to the fact that he has not been assertive. He is becoming more assertive now, and wisely so. He is organizing, and, while these organizations are holding aloof from partisan politics, the farmers of the country, irrespective of party affiliations, are disposed to demand that their interests and needs shall receive fair and impartial consideration from Congress and the Government.

It is a rare thing that the farmer goes to his State legislature or comes to the National Congress to present to the lawmakers his grievances or his demands, because, being fair dealing, honest, and patriotic himself, he accords those virtues to others and trusts his representatives to deal fairly with him and his interest.

Only once during the 10 years since I have been in the Senate have the farmers come in large numbers before a great committee of this body either protesting or demanding.

Recently, when there was pending before the great Committee on Finance a measure vitally affecting their interests, by which it was proposed to apply one rule to the things they sell and a different rule to the things they buy, they came, not as suppliants and beggars, not lobbying around the hotels of the Capital and the Chamber and corridors of the Senate, but before the committee in open session. They came in numbers from many States, some of them far distant from the Capital. A more intelligent and determined set of men I have never seen.

Yet how were they treated? Kindly and with every consideration by the committee, but there it ended. Rebuffed and defied by the administration to which they had appealed for fair treatment and alternately ignored and jeered at by the metropolitan press of the country, they departed discouraged and disheartened.

Yet, Mr. President, I have an idea that these farmers are coming back here again, and that more are coming with them; and that when they come there will be here occupying a majority of these seats those who will listen and hear and heed what they have to say.

But, Mr. President, I have digressed and strayed far afield.

I was discussing the duty of the Government to show the same fostering care to that great primary and basic industry in which 40 per cent of our population is engaged as it has been its wont to show to other important industries of the country.

While I do not wish or mean to minimize what has been done, it can not be denied that what the Government has contributed for agriculture is but a bagatelle compared with what it has done for transportation and manufacturing, and that measurably, as a result of this discriminatory treatment, these industries have grown and expanded far in excess of agriculture. The effect of this discrimination is strikingly illustrated by the fact that while in manufacturing and transportation we have caught up with and passed, in agriculture we have lagged behind, and far behind, the more progressive nations, both in cultural methods and in productiveness per unit.

Mr. President, every consideration of justice and sound public policy would seem to condemn this neglect of this great and important industry. Upon the basis of his own merit and the public weal the farmer is entitled to the highest consideration at the hands of the Government. Indeed, there is no class of people to whom the country owes more than to the farmers.

It is they who through the hardships and trials of pioneer life subdued and made habitable the vast wilderness stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific; it is they who have borne the burdens of those tariff laws that have contributed so largely to the development of our manufacturing; it is they who have chiefly furnished the traffic that has made railroading profitable and the gratuities which have so largely stimulated their construction; it is they who have sustained the balance of world trade in our favor and brought to our shores a constant stream of foreign gold; it is they who have contributed most largely to the production of the national wealth; and it is they who have been our main dependence in peace and our bulwark of safety in war.

The crop of the farmer fixes the standard of the Nation's prosperity. Indeed, so potential is the farmer's crop in its influence upon the business and the prosperity of the country that the bare prospect of a good crop quickens the energies and activities of the people, stimulates and vitalizes every department of trade, while the rumor of a poor crop demoralizes prices, checks trade, and breeds commercial stagnation, and when these fears and hopes materialize in a good or bad crop, as the case may be, the bad or good effect is felt in every branch of industry and in every line of endeavor.

The present condition of this great industry, whether considered in connection with the profits which it yields as com-

pared with the profits of other industries, or in connection with our foreign trade or our domestic needs, challenges and admonishes a more liberal consideration and treatment on the part of the Government than it has received in the past or is at present receiving.

If we are to maintain the equilibrium between our city and country population, if we are to maintain the equilibrium between those engaged in trade, in transportation, in commerce, and manufacturing with those engaged in agricultural pursuits, farm life must be made more attractive and the pursuit of agriculture more profitable.

A brief summary will suffice to show that unless the present trend from the farm to the town is checked at no distant day we will cease to be an exporter of agricultural products, and the main source of our balance in world trade will vanish, leaving us a world debtor instead of a world creditor.

Of course, I do not mean to say that there will not be a continuing expansion in agriculture and a continuous increase in its production, but it is apparent that that expansion and increase will not keep pace with the increase in our consumptive capacity and economic requirements. Indeed, the statistics of the last few years show that our consumption has already nearly overtaken our production.

During the five years beginning with 1890 our people consumed annually an average of 300,000,000 bushels of wheat.

During the next five years the annual consumption averaged 350,000,000 bushels.

During the next five years the consumption was 460,000,000 bushels.

Now the consumption is about 600,000,000 bushels annually.

Our large crop still leaves some surplus for export, but of the great crop of 1909, when the production was 725,000,000 bushels, we exported only 63,000,000 bushels of unground wheat.

In 1910 the export was 42,000,000 bushels, and for the 10 months ending in April, 1911, virtually the year, the export was less than 22,000,000 bushels; and more than one-half of that was from Oregon and Washington.

Of all breadstuffs we exported in 1908, \$205,000,000 worth; the following year, \$150,000,000 worth; the next year, \$121,000,000 worth; and for the year ending June, 1911, there will be a falling off of some \$15,000,000 from that figure.

From this it is apparent that our exports of breadstuffs are diminishing.

Similarly our exports of cattle are falling off. In 1904 we exported 593,000 cattle; five years later only 208,000; in 1910 about 125,000, and for the 10 months of 1911, virtually the year, only 94,000. Our imports of cattle from Mexico were, in 1908, only 63,000; in 1910 they were 188,000; and for the year ending June, 1911, they will be more than 200,000. Thus it appears that we import more cattle than we export, and, although we still export fresh beef, that item is also falling off.

It is evident that the period is not far distant when we will have need here at home for all the provisions we raise.

Up to the present, agriculture has been the main reliance for the sound financial condition of the country. It has maintained the balance of trade in our favor.

In 1908 we exported:

Foodstuffs (crude)	\$189, 000, 000
Foodstuffs (manufactured)	331, 000, 000
Cotton	437, 000, 000

The value of our agricultural products exported in 1907 reached \$1,050,000,000. That was the high-water mark. Since then there has been a considerable decline in all except cotton. A heavy loss in these products would leave the balance of trade against us, resulting in unsettling our currency, disturbing conditions, reducing values, and arresting prosperity.

From this résumé it is apparent that agriculture is the foundation stone of our financial fabric, and every effort should be made to foster and promote it.

There is a market abroad for all the surplus our fields can produce. There is no difficulty in selling the products of this industry. Europe needs all we can spare.

With manufactures it is different. Our manufactures may not be wanted by the world, the products of our factories may become a drug; they may be piled upon the shelves unconsumed, congested, entailing loss, and inviting panics; but our wheat, foods, provisions, and cotton are needed for Europe, and will always find a ready sale abroad. There will be no surfeit of these productions; on the contrary, the outlook is that there may be a serious deficit in them.

Already the relative proportion of population engaged in agriculture is too low, and during the past decade the proportion has continued to diminish.

In the 10 years between 1890 and 1900 the increase in those engaged in agriculture was only 21 per cent, while among those in other occupations it was 32 per cent, and since then this difference has still further increased. The urban population is increasing faster than the rural or agricultural class. Manufacturing, mining, transportation, day laborers, those employed in trade and in mechanical pursuits have unduly increased. The relative increase in agricultural occupations is less than in other lines.

The census bulletin relating to the population of counties in the several States shows that in the tier of great agricultural States from Ohio west, while 600 counties increased in population, 422 decreased. Doubtless the increase in urban population alone kept the other counties from similarly showing a decrease.

In the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, and Michigan there were 313 counties to decrease, while only 266 increased. Such has been the trend of agriculture in that region.

In the South Atlantic States and Cotton States, also including Kentucky, 260 counties fell off, while 1,041 showed an increase.

In North Carolina but 7 counties show a decrease, but if only the rural population be considered, 20 show no increase. Were the same minute examination made as to the counties of the agricultural States of the Northwest, probably it would appear that there has been a falling off of rural population in each of those States.

The towns everywhere have grown at the expense of the country; but the country at the South has not suffered relatively as much as the Northwest has. Our agriculture may be more prosperous, or perhaps there may not be the same demand for labor in the southern towns as elsewhere.

Does not this situation warn us to resort to every method to promote agriculture, not merely for the advantage of the farmer, but for the benefit of all, so that the food supply shall always be adequate, that provisions may be plentiful, that the exports may not be curtailed, that the balance of trade may not be reversed, that the financial condition may not be unsettled, and that the general welfare may be conserved?

The practical question is, How can the Government help the farmer; in what way can it, in present conditions, most promote the interest of agriculture?

By far the most pressing need of the farmer and the most pressing need of the country is good roads and improved highways. We have the finest railways in the world and the poorest highways. The Government has helped to build these railroads and develop this splendid system of long-distance transportation. Why should it not help to build the equally important system of short-distance transportation—the country highways over which the produce of the farm must be hauled before it reaches these national highways?

No one will deny the importance of cheap and quick transportation from ocean to ocean, from port to port, and from city to city. Is not quick and cheap transportation just as essential from the farm to the railway station or to the river landing? Does not the fact that transportation from the farm to the station is 30 times higher than from the station to the point of ultimate distribution appeal for remedy?

If sound public policy requires that so much be done as we have done by legislation and otherwise to cheapen railroad rates, does not the same policy require that something be done to lessen the rate of transportation from the farm to the railroad?

Not only is the subject of good roads the most important which now confronts the farmer and one of the most important now before the people of the country at large, but it is the one in which the people are most deeply interested.

There can be no doubt about the constitutional power of the Government to appropriate money to aid in the construction and improvement of our public roads. That question was fought out in the early days of the Republic.

There can be no escape from the conclusion that the constitutional power to establish post roads is as broad as that to establish post offices, and that the power to establish post roads includes the power to construct, improve, and maintain them.

Aside from considerations of public policy in this matter, I submit that the Government has incurred a moral, if not a legal, liability to contribute at least to the maintenance of public highways of the country by reason of the use which it is making of them in the performance of its constitutional duty to supply the people with mail facilities.

Of the 2,150,000 miles of dirt roads in this country the Government is to-day using over 1,000,000 miles for star routes and Rural Delivery Service. It has established them into post

roads, and it is actually using them every day in the year, except Sundays and holidays, to carry the mails.

These roads have been constructed chiefly by the farmers and are maintained by taxes in a large measure paid by them. The Government has contributed nothing to their construction and contributes nothing to their maintenance.

The Government uses the railroads to carry the mails, but it pays for this service, and usually pays a high price for it. On the other hand, it not only uses the farmers' road for the identical purpose without paying a cent for its use or maintenance, but requires the farmer, besides furnishing the road, also to keep it in good condition; and if he fails or refuses to do so, it discontinues his mails.

In conveying the mails to the farmer the Government is not doing a charity, but is performing a duty it can not rightfully escape, and I submit that the Government has no more right to appropriate the farmers' road to its use without compensation than it has to appropriate the railroads to the same use without compensation.

There would therefore seem to be a legal as well as a moral obligation on the part of the Government arising out of the use of these roads to at least contribute to their maintenance.

But, Mr. President, in addition to this there is a strong economic reason in connection with the use of these public highways as post roads why the Government should contribute not only to their maintenance, but to their improvement—it is the saving which will accrue to the Government in the expense of the star route and Rural Delivery Service from good roads.

On account of the establishment of rural delivery 23,000 post offices have been discontinued, aggregating a saving in salaries of \$8,000,000; likewise, there has been a discontinuance of star route service to the amount of \$18,000,000, cutting off a total of \$26,400,000 of expense.

The total mileage of the rural routes in operation on June 30, 1910, was 993,068, the average mileage per route being 24, and the average number of miles of daily travel by rural carriers was 986,993.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator kindly restate the amount of saving by the abolition of post offices, post routes, and star routes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I estimate it at \$26,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator the figures, approximately, of the expenditures for the Rural Delivery Service?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I have not. I think it is about \$40,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. \$40,000,000. So that the abolition of the rural post offices and the curtailment of the star route service pays a large portion of the expenses of the Rural Delivery Service.

Mr. SIMMONS. All of it, except about \$14,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is very interesting. I am glad to know the fact.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and, as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] suggests to me, the sale of stamps would probably pay that.

The average cost per mile traveled is not quite 12 cents, exclusive of substitutes and of toll and ferrage service. On nearly one-half of the entire roads of the country the Government is now delivering the mails at a cost, say, of 12 cents a mile, and it is plain that any improvement of these roads would reduce the cost of this service.

If through road improvement the time required in covering the route could be lessened one-third or one-fourth, it is obvious that there would be a saving in the cost of the service from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000. On the basis of the present mileage, and without adding a single dollar to the present appropriation, the service could be extended from 200,000 to 300,000 miles, carrying the daily mails to hundreds of thousands of farmers who are now denied them.

In addition to these reasons growing out of the direct pecuniary interest of the Government in better roads for mail purposes, I submit that the Government has an indirect and general interest, arising from its duty to promote the public welfare, which invites and justifies its cooperation in the maintenance and improvement of the postal highways.

The prices of products depend not only upon the cost of production, but also upon the cost of distribution. Whatever, therefore, adds to the cost of the transportation necessarily adds to the ultimate cost of the product.

In recognition of this economic principle there has been much congressional legislation in recent years looking toward Government control of railroads, with a view to establishing reasonable transportation rates.

While railroad rates may still be somewhat too high, speaking generally, it may be said that adequate and cheap facilities exist for the carriage of products from the railroad station to the markets. But while this is true, on account of the bad condition of the roads, the initial charge—the cost of hauling from the farm—is excessively high.

The difference in the cost of transportation by rail and by dirt road is as 1 to 30. Of course, this difference is not all due to bad roads, but it is fully twice as great as it would be if the standard of our public roads were put upon a parity with that of our railroads.

This excessive cost is not only a burden upon agriculture, but it is a tax upon the consumer of its product. The value of farm products is computed at \$9,000,000,000, and as only two-thirds of this amount is consumed at home, the balance has to be marketed, and the average haul for this purpose from the farm to the railroad is estimated at 9 miles. Of the 2,150,000 miles of road over which this haul must be made, about 175,000 miles have been improved; the balance, or nearly 2,000,000 miles, is still unimproved dirt road.

These roads are at best indifferent, frequently positively bad, and sometimes almost impassable. Annually 300,000,000 tons of farm products are hauled over these roads at a cost estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture at 23 cents per ton-mile. If these roads were improved, he estimates that the cost would be reduced to less than half that amount.

According to consular reports the cost of hauling in Germany, France, and England, where the roads are maintained in the best possible condition—indeed, on my trip to Europe a few years ago I did not see a road that was not macadamized—is frequently as low as 7 or 8 cents per ton-mile.

So, if it costs the farmer, as calculated by the department, \$600,000,000 to market his product over our present roads, \$300,000,000 could be saved annually if they were put in reasonably good condition, and, if in as good condition as those abroad, a much larger sum—probably \$400,000,000.

When I first read this estimate of the Secretary of the probable saving to the farmer from good roads I thought it was too large, but an analytical study of the cost of hauling the cotton crop of the South—a subject with which I am, in a measure, familiar—caused me to revise my conclusion.

Cotton has to be hauled when picked to the gin, and then carried to the market, and the seed are likewise to be hauled. This is only a part of the hauling in connection with the cotton crop. It does not include fertilizer and other items.

A crop of 12,000,000 bales will make 3,000,000 loads. The weight of the seed is about twice that of the lint, and there will be about 6,000,000 loads of seed. Thus there will be about 9,000,000 full loads.

Putting the cost of hauling at \$2 per load, it would amount to \$18,000,000.

If by good roads that expense could be reduced, say, one-half the department's estimate, the saving would be about \$9,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator, and I ask it entirely for information, whether the States of the South have, to any considerable extent, made appropriations for the betterment of the roads in that section of the country?

Mr. SIMMONS. The States, as such?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The States, as such, have not to any considerable extent, but the counties and municipalities have largely. For instance, just a few days ago one county—Iredell—in my State voted a bond issue of \$400,000 for good roads, and within the last few years quite a number of other counties have voted almost as large amounts for this purpose. The State of North Carolina, however, has appropriated a small sum to be expended under the State geologist for advice and engineering assistance to counties constructing roads.

Mr. GALLINGER. That amounts to the same thing practically.

Mr. SIMMONS. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that I have long believed—

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to say to the Senator that all over the South this is the question of paramount interest to the people—

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. And they are responding to it by bond issues that a few years ago would have appalled them. They now vote them readily.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that I have long been of opinion that the Federal Government might well co-operate in the betterment of our roads, and I think at one time I introduced a bill in the Senate touching that matter.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. In our section of the country, somewhat despairing of Federal assistance, we have been making very large appropriations from the State treasury for that purpose. Massachusetts has spent a great many millions. New Hampshire, which is a small State, voted two years ago a million dollars, and I think we have spent probably a million and a half dollars for that purpose, and I was merely wondering whether that spirit of advancement had taken possession of the South, as I thought likely it had. To my mind it makes no difference whether the counties or the municipalities vote this money, or the State appropriates it directly from the State treasury.

Mr. SIMMONS. It does not make one particle of difference.

Mr. GALLINGER. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the statistics show that the amount expended in my State for good roads has increased in the past five years 100 per cent. In 1910 over two millions of bonds and about one million of taxes were expended for this purpose. The amount this year will be much larger.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am pleased to know that.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to say to the Senators from North Carolina and from New Hampshire that the State of Virginia has inaugurated a system of State aid to roads. In Virginia the convicts work on the roads, the State paying the entire expense—feeding, guarding, and clothing the convicts—the materials and the machinery being furnished by the county. In addition, where the counties can not get convicts from the State the State treasury appropriates \$250,000 a year on condition that the counties or localities furnish an equal amount.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from North Carolina whether in their States there is good road material available or whether they have to send—

Mr. SIMMONS. I am going to discuss that a little later.

Mr. SWANSON. As far as Virginia is concerned, we have experimented. In sections of Virginia we have been able to construct very fine roads equal to macadam roads, at an expense of \$1,000 or \$1,200 a mile.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is costing us, I will say to the Senator, for what we think is a better type of road, about \$5,000 a mile.

Mr. SWANSON. That is, a macadam road?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; very thoroughly constructed.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the level section of my State, where I live, roads can be constructed at a cost of about \$300 to \$500 a mile.

Mr. SWANSON. May I state to the Senator from New Hampshire, if the Senator from North Carolina will permit me, that by the adoption in Virginia of this system of State aid to roads we have had one of the most wonderful developments of State roads there that any State possesses. We have built in the last four years about 600 miles of macadam road. In addition to that, the counties have issued in the last few years bonds in order to get State aid. The county had to furnish an equal amount, had to furnish material in order to get convicts, had to furnish money in order to get the aid the State gave; and I will state, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to have the Senator from Virginia elaborate it.

Mr. SWANSON. That has produced such a movement in Virginia, from one end of the State to the other, that I am satisfied that if the Federal Government will make an appropriation of money for road improvements conditioned on an equal amount being furnished by the State or local authorities, with joint supervision, joint action, joint building, joint agreement on where the road shall be placed, like they do in all the States where they have State aid, it would produce a great and wonderful improvement, and we would have the same experience in the United States; the local authorities, in order to get State aid, would furnish five or six times as much as is furnished by the State.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator from Virginia how long since the system of using convicts to construct roads was initiated in his State?

Mr. SWANSON. We commenced about five years ago.

Mr. WARREN. It is entirely satisfactory?

Mr. SWANSON. It is satisfactory. Theretofore our convicts had been worked in the penitentiary under contract, making shoes. About five years ago we passed a law providing that all convicts whose terms do not exceed five years in the penitentiary and all jail prisoners shall be compelled to work on the public roads.

I wish to say in this connection it has not only been satisfactory as a paying investment—road improvement—but it has been extremely beneficial to the health and morals of the convicts themselves.

Mr. WARREN. I should like, as the subject is very interesting to me, because as I understand it the legislature of the State which I have the honor to represent in part in this Chamber has just authorized the employment of convicts for road making, to have it still further elaborated. As I understand the Senator, the State works these convicts on the State roads, laying out various State roads, to which the counties add their aid in the way of cash, or are State roads distinguished from county roads?

Mr. SWANSON. No. Here is the system in Virginia, and which has been adopted in a great many other States recently. Other States have passed similar laws. Louisiana passed a law shortly after the Virginia law, I think. We started it.

In my inaugural message as governor I recommended it. It passed the first legislature. The system we have there is that convicts are furnished on the application of each county in camps, I believe, of about 50.

Mr. WARREN. Supported and managed by the county?

Mr. SWANSON. No; the State furnishes money enough to guard them, feed them, clothe them.

Mr. WARREN. And keeps control of them?

Mr. SWANSON. And medicine for them. It keeps absolute control of them. So there can be no sickness, no maltreatment, or excessive work. They are inspected by State authorities. The State has a department of health, which sees that these men are kept in a good, healthy condition. The county furnishes the material, the county furnishes the machinery, and it is estimated that in the construction of roads through convicts, the State furnishing the labor, the State pays about 40 per cent of the cost of construction, and the material and the machinery and other expenses, furnished or provided by the local authorities, amount to about 60 per cent.

Mr. WARREN. Does the State contract in cash through the county's hands or does it contribute sufficient only for the support of the convict force which it throws into use on the road?

Mr. SWANSON. The Virginia law is that counties which get convicts can not participate in the appropriation of cash for road purposes. There are not enough camps to go into every county and treat every section of the county equally fair. The Virginia law provides that counties which do not have convicts get the State aid of \$250,000, divided equally among the counties that do not have the convict camps, according to the taxes that they put into the treasury.

Mr. WARREN. Do I understand that there are county convicts who are also thus employed?

Mr. SWANSON. The county convicts belong to the State. For instance, the circuit judge or corporation judge is authorized—

Mr. WARREN. To take convicts from the county jail?

Mr. SWANSON. To take convicts from the county jail and put them on the State convict road force.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator from Virginia will permit me, I will state to the Senator from Wyoming that in North Carolina we have a system which has proved very satisfactory to us, but which is somewhat different from that in Virginia.

Mr. WARREN. I want to hear all that the Senator from North Carolina may say, but the main thing I want from both Senators, if they will be kind enough to give it, is, first, is it of advantage to the State itself; second, to the counties; and, third, and more important, is it to the advantage and the betterment, moral and physical, of the convicts themselves? I assume it must be, from what the Senators have said. I have intense interest in all the Senator from North Carolina has said and may say upon this most interesting subject—good roads; how to build and finance and keep in repair, and so forth, as well as treatment of the convict question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state that the North Carolina system is different from the Virginia system, in that the convicts who work on the public roads in North Carolina are worked by the counties instead of by the State. We have a general law by which any county can organize a convict force. The courts of that county are authorized, upon the conviction of certain offenses, to sentence the convicts to the roads in that county.

Surrounding counties that have no convict force are authorized also to send their convicts to the counties which have complied with the law and organized a force. In a large number of counties this system has been adopted, and ample provision has been made for carrying it out, and a large part of the road work in those counties is being done by convicts. The results have been satisfactory. It has greatly advanced the cause of good roads, while the outdoor employment has improved the moral and physical condition of the convicts.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield further to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I want to say before the Senator takes his seat, so that he may reply if he wishes, that his subject is a most interesting one, and I have believed that in the sparsely settled new States, where there are very large areas of public lands and where they have never participated in the grant or distribution of the swamp lands, certain of those public lands might properly be placed at the disposal of the State government, to be used in connection with this mode of road building which the Senator has so well described. I say this so that any observation he may wish to make in regard to that feature of it may be included in his remarks.

Mr. SIMMONS. The subject mentioned by the Senator from Wyoming is a new one to me, but it is very interesting, and he makes a valuable suggestion.

I know of no better disposition that can be made of those lands. I thank him for the suggestion and would like very much to confer with him on the subject hereafter. But, Mr. President, my remarks have already extended to a much longer time than I had expected. I will resume and finish them.

Mr. President, \$300,000,000 may be an overestimate of the actual annual loss to the farmer from bad roads, but the loss on the single crop of cotton shows that the aggregate is sufficiently large to furnish an irresistible argument for action to put a stop to this great national waste.

Admit that it is not practicable to save the total amount estimated, yet it is apparent that a great saving can be made through better roads. As this saving would doubtless be shared by the farmer with the consumer in lessening the price of foodstuffs, both the farmer and consumer would be benefited; they would be enabled to buy more; they would make larger purchases; that would be to the advantage of the tradesman, to the advantage of the manufacturer, and of the transportation companies. There would result a general diffusion of benefits. The saving would not be at the expense of others; it would cheapen the cost of marketing, without entailing any loss to anyone. The saving would inure to the benefit of the farmer, in the first instance; and as it would enable him to sell at a lower cost, in the end the benefit would be shared by the consumer.

The cost of making good roads, while considerable, is small compared with the benefits to be derived. Especially is this true of road construction in the South. In that section, where we have sand and clay convenient, the cost of the sand-clay road is not great; and where these ingredients are mixed in proper proportions, they make a road inferior to none in cheapness and durability. The cost ranges from \$350 to \$550 per mile. Recently I have contributed largely to the building of a mile of this character of road over a heavy sandy surface at a cost of a little above \$300, and it is one of the best roads I have ever seen all the year round.

In many parts of the country sand-clay roads are not practicable; there the gravel or macadam roads will have to be built at a cost ranging, according to climate, altitude, and surface conditions, from \$1,500 to \$5,000 per mile.

The cost of road construction in these sections will be large, but not prohibitive; besides, as 90 per cent of the travel is over less than 50 per cent of the highways, it will not be necessary to use this expensive material except on the main avenues of travel.

Europe has built macadam roads everywhere. So can we where necessary. It is true distances in proportion to population are greater here than in Europe; but, on the other hand, we are wealthier and our population is rapidly concentrating and thickening.

To subserve the needs of commerce and travel, we have built railroads over hills and mountains and under great rivers, with an outlay always great, sometimes stupendous. Why should we then balk in building these auxiliary arteries? We have reached the stage in our national development where we can not afford to leave anything undone the doing of which will promote the national welfare, and where the object to be promoted is national as well as local the Government should join in the doing of it.

Heretofore the demand on our energies and the local condition of our country life were distinctly against any great effort to improve our highways. The railroads constituting the arteries of commerce had first to be substantially completed.

We have built about 240,000 miles of railroad at a cost of about \$14,000,000,000, and our needs in that respect have measurably been satisfied. Population has thickened in the older settled sections, products have multiplied, the use of the local highways have largely increased, and the country has at length reached that stage of development which calls for a like development of our system of public highways.

There has, therefore, come into existence a purpose to have better roads, a purpose responsive to a demand arising from national conditions, and this desire for improvement has led to agitation which has resulted in the formation of associations to promote this desirable object. In perhaps every State there is a State association to press forward this work, and there is a national association with the same object. The purpose of all these associations is to promote legislation for the improvement of highways, to organize local associations, and to stimulate the construction of good roads.

Wherever, as the result of this movement, good roads have been constructed the practical benefits have been immediate and far-reaching.

In 25 selected counties of 12 States in which 40 per cent of the roads had been improved the increase in population in the decade ending 1900 was on an average of 30,000 to the county. In 25 counties in the same States where only 1 per cent of the roads had been improved the population during that period, instead of showing an increase, actually decreased 3,000 to the county. Equally marked has been the effect of road improvement upon land values.

Wherever better highways have been introduced these values have increased in a greater or less degree. This increase is seldom less than 20 per cent, and sometimes as high as 100 per cent. The large increase in the value of the abandoned farms of Massachusetts in recent years has been notable. This increased value has been coincident with the improvement of the roads there, and is, I am advised, largely attributable to that.

Good roads have also brought about better conditions of country life. Not only do they lessen the expense of marketing the crop, but they make country life less irksome. They bring the farm and the town nearer together. Measured by travel the town may be two hours distant on a bad road and only one hour distant on a good road, and in carrying a load to market the farmer may make one or two trips, according to the road.

Last, but by no means least, good roads exert a material influence in promoting or retarding education. In many States provisions are now being made to carry the children to school because of the distance of the schoolhouse, resulting from the consolidation of school districts.

In 5 States which rank highest in good roads the average school attendance was found to be 78 out of every 100, and in 5 States that rank lowest in improved highways the average school attendance was 59 out of every 100.

In short, bad roads tend to isolate rural conditions. They render it more difficult to pass about, impede travel, restrict intercourse, interfere with school attendance and churchgoing, promote illiteracy, and are in many other ways a hindrance to progress.

The value of good roads is fully appreciated.

The need is felt.

Conditions now make their betterment imperative.

The people have at last fully awakened to their advantage.

They are ready to participate in the work.

The situation of the country is favorable to the undertaking.

The rural delivery invests the subject with a peculiar interest to the Government, while the progress and welfare of the country is involved.

Economically, industrially, socially, and in every respect the subject invites action.

The Government should do its part to promote the work.

It is too late to contend that the Government should not lend its aid.

It has already spent millions of dollars on waterways.

It has contributed hundreds of millions to railroads.

It has legislated billions in aid of manufacturing.

As a result, manufacturing and transportation have developed faster than agriculture. They have reached a much higher standard of efficiency and excellence. It is now necessary to foster farm life. Rural development has not kept pace with that of the cities and towns. The conveniences and the advantages of urban life are in great contrast to the disadvantages of life on the farm.

While the advantages of our cities are equal to those found elsewhere the conveniences of country life in Europe are far greater than those found here. The country now needs our attention and our best endeavors to promote its development.

The bill I have introduced appropriates \$1,000,000 to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Postmaster General in the improvement of roads over which rural delivery is or may be established, provided the local authorities shall contribute an equal amount for the improvement of the routes selected.

It provides for an investigation and report to Congress of the best and most economical method of improving roads, the cost of such improvement, what amount thereof the Government should contribute and upon what conditions, including the feasibility of raising money for this purpose through a Federal license tax on automobiles engaged in interstate travel, together with a recommendation of a comprehensive plan of Government cooperation to this end.

It will be seen that, while the appropriation now proposed provides for an initiation of Government aid, the proposition is essentially tentative and experimental and is directed largely to eliciting information to enable Congress to work out a scheme of general application.

It is a mere beginning, cautious indeed, but in line with the policy pursued by the Government in the inauguration of rural and city delivery, irrigation, postal savings banks, parcel post for rural routes, and so forth.

In addition to a direct appropriation for this purpose, when the report and recommendation called for in the bill is made Congress will doubtless give consideration to auxiliary methods of providing funds for promoting the object in view.

I have provided in the bill for a report by the Secretary of Agriculture upon the feasibility of imposing a license tax upon automobiles engaged in interstate traffic for raising funds with which to carry on this work on the part of the Government.

Mr. BACON. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have simply proposed that as a subject for investigation.

Mr. BACON. I wish to make another suggestion in that connection, if the Senator will permit me. I do not know whether his suggestion goes to that extent or not, but I think the license should be graduated according to the speed used by the automobiles in traveling over the roads.

Mr. SIMMONS. I entirely agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. BACON. I am not jesting about it; I am in serious earnest. I think that an automobile which will go through the country in a decent, respectable, quiet style ought to be permitted to do so at a reasonable rate, but one that goes at a speed which makes it dangerous for anybody to be in the neighborhood of the road, to travel on it or to cross it, in my opinion ought to be made to pay a tax which will be sufficient to deter them from any such indulgence.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I will suggest to the Senator from Georgia in this connection that the danger is not only increased by the speed, but the injury to the road is greatly increased.

Mr. BACON. Certainly; and not only the injury to the road but the dust raised by them makes it unbearable to be anywhere near the road for half an hour afterwards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rose to emphasize precisely what the Senator from North Carolina has himself stated, as to the danger from an automobile running at great speed—and they utterly violate the laws of every State when they get on our highways—and also the destruction of the roads which results from the great speed on the part of the automobile. As an illustration I will take our beautiful macadam roads in New England, costing from \$5,000 to \$6,000 a mile. The surface of them is destroyed in a very short time, and we have got to repair them every year. We have a tar preparation which we are now using that protects them very well. But it is a consideration of vast moment that while the people have been taxed to construct these roads we are permitting a certain class of people, usually in violation of law, to run this great juggernaut over the roads at a rate of speed which destroys them in a very short time. I think they ought to be taxed, and taxed very heavily, and I am glad to say that in our section of the country that matter is receiving very serious attention.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say to the Senator that with a view of getting information upon all these phases of the matter I have provided expressly in the bill I have introduced for an

investigation and a report to Congress upon all the phases of the question, and especially upon the feasibility of a national registration and license tax on automobiles engaged in interstate traffic.

The scheme of raising money for this purpose by a Government license tax upon automobiles engaged in interstate travel is an interesting one, and will doubtless receive thorough consideration. A number of States are now raising large sums for this purpose through the medium of a State license tax on these machines.

There are half a million automobiles in the country now, and they will rapidly multiply as road improvement progresses until here, as in Europe, they will in part take the place of the railroads for a certain class of travel.

Estimating that one in every five of these machines will be used in interstate travel—that, I will say, is not quite one-third of the estimate which is made by the department officials with whom I have conferred about this matter—a fee of \$10 on machines so used would yield an annual revenue of \$1,000,000, without interfering with the license charge imposed by the State. Undoubtedly there are possibilities in the suggestion of a license tax, and its feasibility doubtless will receive consideration from Congress on the coming in of the report, should this present proposition become a law.

If the practical results of this measure, if adopted, are satisfactory, as I am sure they will be, there is no reason to doubt the early adoption by Congress of a comprehensive and well-devised plan of national cooperation which will eventuate in advancing the postal highways of the country to a condition commensurate with the public needs and in keeping with the national standard of progress.

The immediate effects of the adoption of this bill can not fail to be advantageous. It will stimulate interest throughout the country and give shape and direction to the influences now at work for road improvement.

Of course the work will be carried on through the Office of Good Roads of the Department of Agriculture, which has already done so much in arousing public interest and in wisely aiding and directing local efforts.

Up to this time the work of this department has been confined largely to elementary instruction to local road builders, lectures, object lessons in supervision, and advisory work. Under this act the power of the department officials in these respects will be greatly enlarged, while the means will be supplied for experimental work of building short stretches of good roads in the various States of the Union.

The result in actual betterment of roads, while great, will be small compared to the results which will flow from the impetus which will be given to the movement for good roads throughout the country.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall conclude in a moment.

Mr. WORKS. Before the Senator concludes, I should like to ask him whether in his own State there is any general system of improving highways?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will wait until I have finished my sentence, I shall be glad to answer, as I am closing.

Mr. WORKS. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. Manifestly the time is ripe for the Government to enter upon this cooperative work. The conditions are similar to those conditions in agriculture which led the department to engage in experimental farm work—a step forward which has proved a great advantage to the farming interests. It would be difficult to overestimate the beneficial results of this experimental farm work. Some of them have been surprising. The heaven of improved methods is working, and its effects are manifested in increased production, in greater diversification of crops, and in enlarged profits. The whole country and all the people are the beneficiaries.

Shall the Government, having so auspiciously started upon the work of reclaiming the great and honorable calling of agriculture from the drudgery to which conditions had condemned it, now halt and hesitate to do the one thing needful to restore it to its rightful position of primacy among the great industries of the Nation? I hope not, I think not, and I had almost said I know it will not.

Now, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina whether in his own State there is any general system of constructing and improving the highways as State highways?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that there is no general system in my State of State highways, but there is now

on foot, recently inaugurated and over which the people have become very much worked up, a great scheme to build a central highway from the sea to the mountains. That road will pass through about 25 counties, and its length will be between 450 and 500 miles. The present plan is for that road to be built by the counties through which it passes. While there has been no State appropriation for the improvement of State highways, we have legislation which provides for a county system which any county can adopt. Many of the counties have taken up this subject with great vigor, and, as I have stated, probably in the absence of the Senator from California, are imposing taxes and issuing bonds for that purpose. There are a number of counties in my State that have issued bonds in amounts from three to four hundred thousand dollars at one time for the improvement of the roads in those counties.

I mentioned a little while ago one county which only a few days ago, within the last month, I think—not one of the largest or richest counties, but a progressive county—voted \$400,000 in bonds at one time for road improvement. That is going on all over the State. I should say that one-third in number of the counties, comprising about one-half of the State, have issued bonds, or are now preparing to issue bonds, for that purpose, while many of the other counties are doing the same work by current taxation.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I ask these questions because, under the provisions contained in this bill, the cooperation which is provided for would necessarily have to be with the local authorities in each county where there is no general system under the control of the State.

This is a question in which the people of my State are very deeply interested. We have very lately voted bonds to the amount of \$18,000,000 for the purpose of constructing State highways throughout the State. In my own county we have voted \$3,500,000 in bonds for the purpose of bettering the roads in our county. That feeling is spreading all over the State of California, and naturally I am interested in any movement of that sort which is likely to bring results. I was only undertaking to find out as nearly as I could what would be the probable effect of the provision by which the officers of the National Government are authorized to cooperate with the State authorities in undertaking to improve the condition of the highways in the different States.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am very happy to have the information the Senator gives in reference to the work of constructing and improving roads in his State. The bill I have introduced appropriating a million dollars for experimental work on rural routes to be selected by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Postmaster General, specifically provides:

That the State or the local subdivision thereof in which such improvement is made under this provision shall furnish an equal amount of money for the improvement of the road or roads so selected.

So that it would be a matter of adjustment by the Secretary of Agriculture with the local authorities or the State, as the case might be.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill upon which I have submitted these remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2846) for experimental improvement of rural delivery roads by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Postmaster General, for investigating the subject of Federal registration and license of automobiles used in interstate travel, and for other purposes, introduced by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Postmaster General in improving the conditions of roads to be selected by them over which rural delivery is or may hereafter be established, such improvement to be for the purpose of ascertaining the increase in the territory which could be served by each carrier as a result of such improvement, the possible increase of the number of delivery days in each year, the amount required in excess of local expenditures for the proper maintenance of such roads, and the relative saving to the Government in the operation of the rural delivery service, and to the local inhabitants in the transportation of their products by reason of such improvement: *Provided,* That the State or the local subdivision thereof in which such improvement is made under this provision shall furnish an equal amount of money for the improvement of the road or roads so selected. Such improvement shall be made under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General are hereby directed to report to Congress within one year after the ratification of this act the result of their operations under this act, the number of miles of road improved, the cost of same, and the feasibility and desirability of a Federal license tax on automobiles engaged in interstate travel, and such other information as they may have acquired in connection with the operation of this act, together with such recommendations as shall seem wise for providing a general plan of national aid for the improvement of postal roads in cooperation with the States and counties, and to bring about as near as possible

such cooperation among the various States as will insure uniform and equitable interstate highway regulations, and for providing necessary funds for carrying out such plans of national aid, if it shall be deemed feasible to provide the same or any part thereof otherwise than by appropriation from the Treasury for that purpose.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with Canada, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate shall vote on what is known as the Root amendment to the pending bill before adjournment on Monday next. I do that because the Senator from New York wants to leave town, and I do not think there will be any objection to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that a vote be taken upon the so-called Root amendment to the pending bill before adjournment on Monday next. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts, approved March 4, 1911.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. PENROSE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out from line 7 to line 24, both inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert:

So much of the naval appropriation act, approved March 4, 1911, as authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payments under public contracts, is amended by omitting the words "ninety per centum of," so that the proviso will read as follows: "And provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to make partial payments from time to time during the progress of the work under existing contracts and all contracts hereafter made under the Navy Department for public purposes, but not in excess of the value of the work already done; and the contracts hereafter made shall provide for such insurance as the Secretary of the Navy may deem sufficient, and for a lien in favor of the Government, which lien is hereby made paramount to all other liens, upon the articles or thing contracted for on account of all payments so made; provided that partial payments shall not be made under such contracts except where stipulated for, and then only in accordance with contract provisions."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERMAN. Let the amendment be explained.

Mr. WARREN. I am going to explain it.

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to understand if the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania is not to reenact a provision with reference to the last naval appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was about to say that since the committee reported this joint resolution a bill has passed the Senate which provides for the purpose the amendment has in view, and another bill carrying, among other things, a similar provision has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Naval Affairs. I think it is admitted on both sides that the provision is a proper one. Certainly it is urgently requested on the part of the Navy Department that it ought to be a part of this measure, which seeks to amend the last naval appropriation act.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I would not be frank if I did not state to the Senator in charge of the bill that an amendment as important as that can not pass with only a few Senators present.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CULBERSON. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. This amendment is precisely the same as the bill introduced by the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which passed the Senate and which has been, as I understand, favorably reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs in the House of Representatives; but for some reason or other it has not made progress in the House. It is recommended by the Secretary of the Navy in a communication addressed to the Senator from California, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which is embodied in the report on the bill

which the Senate passed and is to be found in report No. 23, Sixty-second Congress, first session.

The matter is somewhat complicated, but it has been carefully examined by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and by other members of the committee. It has already passed the Senate and is to-day on the calendar of the House. It is intended to cure some legal complications which have arisen inadvertently. If the Senator desires me to go on and explain the matter, I will do so; but I assure him it is all right.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Culbertson	Overman	Smoot
Bailey	Cullom	Owen	Stone
Borah	Cummins	Page	Sutherland
Bourne	Foster	Penrose	Swanson
Bradley	Gallinger	Perkins	Taylor
Bristow	Heyburn	Poindexter	Thornton
Brown	Hitchcock	Pomerene	Townsend
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Reed	Warren
Burnham	Kern	Root	Watson
Burton	La Follette	Shively	Westmore
Chamberlain	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
Clapp	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Mich.	
Crawford	Newlands	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I was requested this morning by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] to say, in the event of a roll call, that he was engaged in his duties as a member of the committee now having under investigation the Lorimer case.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is in attendance upon the hearings being conducted by the committee having under consideration the Lorimer case.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] is unavoidably detained from the Senate as a member of the committee investigating the Lorimer case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. PENROSE. I am informed, and I believe correctly, that the provision of the naval appropriation act, which this amendment is intended to correct, was dropped out in conference at the closing hours of the last session, and inadvertently retained in transcribing the bill by the enrolling clerks.

It also maintains simply the law as administered heretofore until certain old statutes had attention called to them, and some question was raised as to the right of the Navy Department to contract as heretofore.

I ask the clerk to read the letter to the chairman of the Naval Committee, the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], which is embodied in the communication addressed to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 1, 1911.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor to invite your attention to my letter of the 3d of February last requesting that a provision be inserted in the naval bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payments not in excess of the value of the work already done under public contracts, and stating the reasons on which such request was based.

The provision relating to such partial payments contained in the bill as passed, which is said to have been included by clerical error and which it is proposed to repeal by joint resolution No. 1, now before the Senate, authorizes, as you are aware, payments up to only 90 per cent of the value of the work already done.

If said provision should remain unrepealed and unamended, the stipulations in certain existing contracts would be violated and this department would probably be exposed to suits for damages, whether the claims were valid or not, on account of the withholding of 10 per cent of the amounts promised to be paid. If it should be repealed and nothing substituted in its place, the department might, it is assumed, in accordance with what is understood to be the construction the accounting officers place upon the existing law, be forbidden to make any payments under said existing contracts, and the contractors, being thereby subjected to more extensive losses than in the other event, would have greater reason for claiming damages from the Government.

Should the department not be authorized to make partial payments under future contracts in any amount, or if payments were restricted to 90 per cent of the value of the work done, the Government would, obviously, be obliged to pay as part of the contract price in each case the whole cost or a part of the cost of financing the work. For the vessels last authorized the cost of withholding 10 per cent of the contract price, made up of sums ranging from \$3,000 for each \$500,000 submarine boat to \$50,000 for a \$6,000,000 battleship, would amount to approximately \$100,000 in excess of their cost under the previous plan of making partial payments. For these burdens no compensating advantage would be derived by the Government.

The precautions and safeguards provided by the department's contracts for the protection of the public interests are comprehensive, and would seem to make unnecessary and disadvantageous to the Govern-

ment the withholding of the entire contract price or of a percentage of partial payments until the completion of the work. Indeed, it is probable that none of the shipbuilding companies could finance the building of \$6,000,000 vessels, such as have recently been undertaken and are likely to be authorized in the future.

In view of the foregoing it is urgently recommended that enactment be secured authorizing the department to make partial payments under its public contracts not in excess of the value of the work already done.

Inclosed herewith is a draft of a provision that would, it is believed, in case of the passage of the joint resolution mentioned above, be adequate for the purpose, wherein, as will be observed, the Government's interests are to be protected by insurance and by a lien that is made paramount. If the provision in the naval act of March 4 be not repealed, an amendment thereof to give the department the discretion as to payments granted by the inclosed draft is earnestly desired.

The provisions of the accompanying draft are the same as those of the draft transmitted with the department's letter of the 3d of February mentioned above.

Faithfully, yours,

GEO. VON L. MEYER.

HON. GEORGE C. PERKINS,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate.

Mr. WARREN obtained the floor.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator pardon me for a moment?

Mr. CULBERSON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I think, under the circumstances, some explanation should be made of the present condition of this joint resolution.

It came over from the House in its original form and went to the Committee on Appropriations. There was a contention about this naval matter, and the proposition then made to the committee was different from the one now made. The committee rejected that and reported the joint resolution exactly as it came from the House, except as to recommendations regarding preamble and title.

The Navy Department has made contracts for large battle-ships, which were duly signed, and carried the promise of the Government to pay, as fast as the work proceeds, the value of the work in place. This has been the custom for years. But this 90 per cent clause that was included—and, as it seems, erroneously included in the naval appropriation act—called attention to the fact of partial payments and caused the matter to go before the Department of Justice, and its report is that it requires some legislation to enable the work to be done and the Government to make the advance payments as per contracts.

Now, in the manner in which it is presented here, this amendment puts it back exactly where it was before any legislation was attempted. It puts it where the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, may pay as contracted for on these vessels, not exceeding the actual cost of the work in place.

If that proves to be wrong, of course we should remedy it hereafter. The question comes whether we want to abrogate the contracts already made, and whether we are taking any undue risk in permitting those contracts to be carried out according to their terms.

Now, the condition of legislation with respect to this shipbuilding left things in such shape that the Senate—and I regret to say I was away at the time—took the matter up, and passed substantially this legislation that is now proposed here as an independent measure, and, as I understand after inquiry, without opposition. It went to the House, and the House committee has reported a similar House measure favorably, and it is now on the House calendar.

Of course we can not talk here much about the action of the House, but my information is that it is for the best interests of the Government to allow this amendment to go in, and send the measure to conference. Of course in conference the House will have its conferees and the matter can be adjusted satisfactorily to both bodies.

While I was opposed originally to amending this joint resolution in committee, and while I think I would be opposed now to the same proposition that came then, yet as it comes now—and there has been no opportunity and, perhaps, no reason why it should be taken to the Appropriations Committee—I have been willing to accept the amendment and to let it go to conference.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, this joint resolution, as it came from the House of Representatives, was properly sent to the Committee on Appropriations. I happen to be a member of that committee, and was present at the meeting which considered the joint resolution, and at which it was decided not to adopt the suggestion which is now before the Senate, but to report favorably the joint resolution as it passed the House of Representatives without amendment, which was merely to correct—that is the substance of it, although the effect would be that of a law—an erroneous enrollment of the bill.

Now, the proposed amendment has never been referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which has this matter in charge,

so far as I have any information, and it never has been considered by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CULBERSON. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. On that point, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, which has in charge the appropriation for the Naval Department.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand that.

Mr. PENROSE. And it has been favorably reported. And also, Mr. President, the joint resolution is to correct an error in enrollment, because I think the records will prove conclusively that the enrolling clerks failed to copy the bill correctly as agreed on by the conferees, and this provision was dropped out. I do not think there is any dispute about it.

Mr. CULBERSON. If the Committee on Naval Affairs had anything at all to do with this amendment, it ought to have been considered by it and then referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which has charge of the joint resolution. But nothing of that kind has been done, so far as I have any information, and the amendment which is proposed has been offered on the floor and has never been printed, and I for one have not had an opportunity to examine it.

I suggest, Mr. President, that the proposed amendment be again reported, to see what it really is, before the Senate attempts to act on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. On page 3 strike out lines 7 to 24, both inclusive, and insert:

So much of the naval appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, as authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payment under public contracts, is amended by omitting the words "90 per cent of," so that the proviso will read as follows: "And provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to make partial payments from time to time during the progress of the work under existing contracts and all contracts hereafter made under the Navy Department for public purposes, but not in excess of the value of work already done; and the contracts hereafter made shall provide for such insurance as the Secretary of the Navy may deem sufficient, and for a lien in favor of the Government, which lien is hereby made paramount to all other liens, upon the articles or thing contracted for on account of all payments so made; provided that partial payments shall not be made under such contracts except where stipulated for, and then only in accordance with contract provisions."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs when the provision which is in controversy was inserted in the naval appropriation act. It was thought at that time desirable to make that change, but it was afterwards ascertained that it probably would not work to the advantage of the Government, and it undoubtedly was dropped out in conference. I do not think there is any serious question as to that.

Mr. President, this is distinctively and clearly a matter for the Naval Committee to determine, rather than the Committee on Appropriations. It relates to an appropriation for the Navy or a provision relating to the Navy, and it has been submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs and reported back favorably; and I do not think it would either expedite the matter or lead to any better legislation if we held it up and referred it to the Committee on Appropriations.

I feel very sure that the provision is a wise one. No harm has come to the Government from a system that prevailed before this attempted amendment was engaged in, and if we agree to the amendment, which has been submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], we simply restore the matter to the condition it has been in for a great many years and concerning which there has been, so far as I know, no serious complaint.

I trust, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] will not insist upon sending this to the Committee on Appropriations, but will permit the amendment to be agreed to, so that we may get this troublesome question off our hands.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, my only purpose was to call attention to the irregularity, as I conceive it to be, in presenting this amendment, and also to invite attention to the fact that the effect of it will be to override the policy suggested in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GALLINGER. The measure will go to conference at any rate, and then it can be determined whether the House will insist. If the House insists upon this joint resolution as it came to this body, then, of course, the Senate will not have power to make the change.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, it is made to appear very clearly by the communication from the Secretary of the Navy that under the existing law if this amendment is not

adopted or some amendment made to existing law the Navy Department will be very much embarrassed, not only in reference to making contracts, but in carrying out contracts already made. It is found that the auditing officers of the Treasury Department are unwilling to approve vouchers for partial payments on contracts which the Navy Department has made for construction work for the Navy, such as battleships and other vessels.

Mr. PENROSE. For 50 years—

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. For 50 years, as the Senator from Pennsylvania says; for a long time, I know, the department has been in the habit of making these advances, but some confusion is found in the legislation enacted in the closing hours of the last session, and as the law now stands the Navy Department finds itself unable to protect the public interest as it should be protected. Indeed, the Secretary of the Navy says that unless some legislation is passed he contemplates suits against the United States Government for not complying with the contracts it has already entered into.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia will suspend for a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the pending joint resolution may be disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Under those conditions an amendment to this joint resolution, which passed the House and came over here, has been offered on the floor of the Senate, which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] thinks is somewhat irregular. It is not the best practice, of course, for important amendments to be acted upon by the Senate before they have been considered by a committee, but it is an everyday practice. Any Senator has a right to offer an amendment to a pending bill. When a bill has been reported from a committee, it is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

The Senator from Pennsylvania offered an amendment, and it is a plain and simple one. It simply provides for advances to be made by the Navy Department on account of work being done under a contract with the Navy Department. It is work that is being done for the Government, and this authority to make advances is protected and hedged about in the safest possible manner. In the first instance, the contractors are required to give bond or security. In the next place, before the advances are made, he is required to insure the ship that is in progress of construction for the protection of the Government. In addition to that insurance, the amendment gives to the Government a lease paramount to all other leases on the vessel being constructed. There is no possibility, in other words, that the Government can lose anything if the amendment is passed. It is absolutely certain that the Government will lose something if the amendment is not passed, because the Secretary of the Navy says that he contemplates that in the present uncertain state of the law the Government will be sued for damages if some relief is not given.

So far as my investigation of the subject goes, and it has been carefully and thoroughly made, I have not a particle of doubt on the subject. I feel that this legislation is safe and necessary and urgent, that it ought to be passed, and passed at once.

REDUCTION OF MILITARY EXPENSES.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I have little familiarity with the subject, but my attention was attracted by a joint resolution in which it is proposed to reduce the appropriations for the next fiscal year various sums aggregating nearly \$400,000. As I have been greatly interested in urging that at this extra session we should take action regarding the reduction of the military appropriations of the Government for the Army and the Navy for the ensuing fiscal year from about \$230,000,000 to \$200,000,000, I have been greatly gratified to observe that by the joint action of both Houses it is now proposed to reduce those expenditures at least \$400,000 through the items inserted in this joint resolution.

In pursuit of the general inquiry as to this movement to reduce the expenditures of the Government during the next fiscal year, a movement which I regard as essential, in view of a possible reduction of the revenue through tariff revision, I would like to ask the Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, whether any other bills or

resolutions are pending which have passed the House of Representatives looking to a reduction of appropriations already made for the expenditures of the Government during the next fiscal year?

Mr. WARREN. The joint resolution carries a reduction of between \$300,000 and \$400,000 because of errors in enrollment in the appropriation bills of the last Congress. It is not really a reduction of what Congress intended to appropriate.

Now, as to reductions sought other than these to be made from standing appropriations, I have no knowledge of an official nature that any act has ever been proposed. We have nothing before the Committee on Appropriations of that nature, excepting one, and that is a joint resolution which came from the Committee on Accounts of the other House and which proposes to cut off some 35 or 45 per cent of the police force of the Capitol Building. That is the only other measure of the kind that I know of.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I greatly regret to hear the statement of the Senator from Wyoming. I entertained the hope as I read this resolution that it meant a real effort on the part of Congress, initiated in the House of Representatives, to reduce the appropriations for the next fiscal year. We all know that, outside of the appropriations for the Post Office Department, the annual appropriations reach pretty nearly \$800,000,000, and of that sum one-half is expended either in taking care of those who have fought in the wars that have passed and their dependents or in providing for the wars of the future.

NEED OF CONSTRUCTIVE WORK.

I think there is a growing impatience in the country regarding these vast military expenditures. It is the belief of the people of the country that a very large portion of this vast sum could be better expended in great constructive works, such as public buildings throughout the country, upon which at least \$30,000,000 annually should be spent, and the development of our rivers through cooperation with the States, upon which at least \$50,000,000 more should be annually expended.

We must provide for these great constructive works demanded by the country, either by a reduction of military expenditures or by increased taxes. So far as increased taxes are concerned, in the absence of constitutional authority for an income tax, we will have to rely upon an increase of the corporation tax, which, through a graduated system of increase, can be made productive of increased revenue through taxation imposed upon great industrial organizations known as trusts, organizations which, under our protective system, are privileged to levy heavy taxes upon the people and which therefore should all the more readily contribute to the burdens of government.

But we ought to make an effort, it seems to me, at this session to cut down the appropriations for the next year already authorized by Congress. I believe that if we would organize a board in each one of these departments, acting under the direction of the President, which would bring the chiefs of the various services into cooperation and authorize and direct them to reduce these appropriations from \$230,000,000 down to \$200,000,000, giving them a comparatively free hand as to the items which should be reduced, we would have at the end just as efficient a service with a lessened expenditure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The present fiscal year will terminate in about eight days. The appropriations that were made were for the next fiscal year, and doubtless the departments have made arrangements and contracts. The Senator would hardly break into those contracts made for the next year and reduce them arbitrarily? Would not the Senator's efforts be more wisely directed if they should be made to operate as to the appropriations which will be made in the future, and not undertake to interrupt those that have been made after due consideration and recommendation from the departments, and upon which the departments have doubtless made their plans for the next fiscal year?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am anxious to act in both ways. I would not, of course, act in such a way as to violate any contracts which had been made by the Government. I would not, of course, act in such a way as would seriously disturb the administration of the War Department or of the Navy Department, but I do believe that authority can wisely be given to the President, with the aid of such a board, to largely reduce the military expenditure, and that if the chiefs of the various services are called into cooperation with a view to making reductions in administration, reductions in construction, large savings will be made.

A FREER HAND SHOULD BE GIVEN THE DEPARTMENTS.

I believe, Mr. President, we have not been accustomed to give the departments a sufficiently free hand in the administration of the funds intrusted to them. Congress has been so jealous of its powers that it has sought to the last detail to prescribe the items of every proposed expenditure. It has been the custom of Congress practically to put the departments in a strait-jacket, so that the organizing power, the administrative capacity, and the constructive capacity of the intelligent officials connected with those services have not been brought into play in their full scope.

We all know how in the great corporations this system of cooperation between the various services, of comparative accounts, of frequent consultations, is accomplished, and how it results in the present perfected system of economic administration which has given the great corporations such high industrial and business efficiency.

My observation is that we have in the military and naval service of the country and in the civil service of the country men of the highest capacity, men capable of dealing with the most important of problems and of works, men animated by high standards of integrity, men who are proud of the fact that they are in the Government service, and who give that service their best effort, even though their service in other directions might result in large personal fortunes. I do not underrate at all the capacity of the civil service of the United States or the capacity of our Army or Navy officers. I think their capacity is of the highest standard. But we have not made it as efficient as we could by giving them a freer hand in the administration within the limits of the appropriation made by Congress.

IMPORTANCE OF BUDGET COMMITTEE.

I believe it is a much wiser view of this whole question for Congress to take, in the first instance, through a committee such as the Committee on Public Expenditures, which was authorized by the last Congress and abandoned in this, a full survey of all the operations of the Government, to ascertain the requirements of the various departments and services, and then to adjust the proposed appropriations to the requirements in such a way as to bring all within the limits of the revenue to be obtained, and to see to it that this vast income is not entirely spent in administration, which is a thing of the hour, but that a large portion of it is spent in great constructive work that will have enduring value to the Nation.

We need such a committee, a committee that will bring in cooperation the chairmen of the various appropriating committees of the Senate, and which will take a broad and general view of the situation that would result in a limitation of appropriations to each department and service, but not a limitation in such elaborate detail as to tie the hands of those who administer the fund and prevent them from expending that fund in such a way as to secure the highest results both in administration and construction.

Mr. President, we have a long time before us at this session, and I take advantage of this opportunity to urge upon the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that something be done at the present session to revive the Committee on Public Expenditures or to call into being a committee of similar duties, so that it can enter scientifically and comprehensively upon this question, adjusting the expenditures of the country to the revenues of the country in such a way as to take care of both administration and construction, and not let the great constructive work of the country be neglected as it has been for years past.

I regret to see that the pending joint resolution is not upon the lines which I first thought it was built upon, namely, an effort to practically reduce by joint resolution of Congress appropriations already made. Whilst it has that effect, whilst it practically reduces the appropriations \$400,000, yet the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations assures me that it only corrects errors in the enrollment of the bills at the last session and is not passed in pursuance of an earnest intention to reduce the expenditures of the Government and to restore a needed economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move to amend the joint resolution on page 2 by striking out lines 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 2 strike out lines 12 to 16, inclusive, in the following words:

So much of the general deficiency appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, as appropriates the sum of \$500 to reimburse the State board of regents of the University of Idaho for the premium paid on an indemnity bond is repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Committee on Appropriations have reported an amendment to strike out the preamble. Without objection, the preamble is stricken out.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution to amend certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911."

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, for many years various efforts have been made to establish a department of health of the United States, and during the last year both Houses of Congress have been considering this question, and the most overwhelming evidence has been submitted in the Senate and House hearings justifying the establishment of such department. There has arisen in opposition to the department of health an organized movement resisting the establishment of the department, under a so-called League of Medical Freedom, on the alleged ground that it would promote one school of medicine over another school of medicine and invade the rights of the States and of individual citizens.

I introduced at the beginning of the present session Senate bill No. 1, providing for the establishment of a department of health, which did not place the head of that department in the Cabinet, but which expressly provided against any possible invasion of State or of individual rights and against any discrimination for or against any so-called system or school of medicine.

Mr. President, I am entirely opposed to promoting one school of medicine over another school of medicine. My purpose in urging a department of public health has been to establish a department of human conservation—educational rather than regulative—which should deal with the matter from an educational standpoint, so as to make effective and efficient the knowledge which we are slowly acquiring with regard to the preservation of human life.

And the preservation of human life does not deal primarily with the curing of a man after he is desperately sick. It should not be regarded as a science devoted to the cure of bubonic plague after bubonic plague has been established in the human organism. It should not deal with the question of tuberculosis after it has been contracted, but it should deal with this terrible disease by preventive means. The important point is to prevent it—not to merely cure it. These diseases are easy to prevent, but almost impossible to cure.

A department of human conservation—called, for convenience, a department of health—would naturally deal with instructing the people of the United States in well-ascertained facts with regard to sanitary engineering, sanitary construction of streets, alleys, houses, sewerage, water supply, milk supply, and food supplies generally; proper care of the markets, the control of insect life, which is so frequently the cause of disease, as in the cases of the malaria and yellow-fever mosquito; the extermination of the house fly, with its typhoid-fever germ; and the education of the people, through circulars, authoritative publications, through the schools, and through special instructors on the rules of right living.

The instruction of the people as to the value of fresh air, clean air, clean bodies, the proper use of the bath and hot and cold water, and the proper precautions to guard against infectious diseases. It would disseminate full and complete knowledge relative to diseases of sex now prevalent throughout the United States and throughout the world by reason of the gross ignorance of young people arriving at the age of puberty with no knowledge whatever upon this vital topic and thus exposed by gross ignorance to the most dangerous maladies.

These things, and much other interesting information, which, under proper guidance, could be made the common knowledge and the common property of the people of the United States, operating through the municipal, State, and Federal agencies, within their strict constitutional limitations, are of vital importance to the people of the United States, to their health and

longevity and to their happiness; to their physical, mental, and moral well-being. Our insane asylums are full of syphilitics. Our blind institutions are filled in like manner through venereal diseases. Our cities are filled with tuberculosis victims carrying disease of the most malignant character into the houses of the rich and the poor, especially the poor.

I desire the country to understand that the purpose of the department of health is in reality that of race conservation, the preservation of human life and of human energy, and that there is great need for the cooperation of all classes of men, including the Christian Scientists, who have undoubtedly been of genuine public service in teaching people better methods of self-control. This is also true with regard to the school of osteopathy, as well as other so-called schools of medicine, chief of which are the so-called regular physicians, sometimes called allopaths and homeopaths.

We need prevention more than cure, however. We have not so much the need for the regular physician, as his function is generally understood—that is, as a man who will give medicine to cure a sick patient, as we have need for his services, and for the services of all schools of medicine, in their far more important aspect of preventing diseases by instructing patients, whether sick or well, in the rules of right living.

This, indeed, is the great work which has been done by the regular physician, and which has been done likewise by other schools of medicine not known as regulars and by men who were not physicians at all. The great Pasteur was a chemist, not a physician. Dr. Wylie is a food expert, not a medical practitioner. It seems to me that all good men who desire the welfare of the human race should be favorable to the establishment of a department of public health, which shall not give special preferment to any school of medicine or system of medicine, but which shall devote itself to the conservation of the human race, and which shall study with care and with patience all claims of all schools of men engaged in the art of healing, in the more important art of preventing disease and ill health. This will include osteopaths, Christian Scientists, physical culturists, and a great variety of students of human health.

I have drawn Senate bill No. 1 in such a way that the proposed department is not permitted to discriminate in favor of any school or system of medicine; so that it shall not invade any function of any State; so that it shall not enter the house of any individual without his free consent and invitation.

The real function of a department of public health is to prevent disease. The cure of diseases should not comprise one-twentieth part of the activities of such a department. What we want is to prevent people being made sick, not merely to attempt to cure them when they are ready for the grave.

In this connection I call attention to a very important department established by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York, a description of which appears in the New York Commercial. William A. Day, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, has just announced the organization of a "conservation department," with Elmer E. Rittenhouse, former president of the Provident Savings Life Assurance Society, at its head. It proposes to circularize the millions of men who hold policies in that assurance society on the gentle art of self-care as a means of the preservation of their own health, the care of the health of their families, their households, and they expect to use this system as a practical money-making proposition, because, having assured the life of their policy holders, they want to prolong their lives as much as possible.

The New York Commercial, of June 17, 1911, makes the following announcement:

[New York Commercial, June 17, 1911.]

"EQUITABLE ESTABLISHES CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT—ELMER E. RITTENHOUSE TO BE COMMISSIONER IN CHARGE—PURPOSE OF NEW BUREAU WILL BE TO CONSERVE HEALTH AND LIVES OF POLICY HOLDERS AND PREVENT LAPSES—EDUCATIONAL AND SANITARY CAMPAIGN PLANNED.

"William A. Day, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, yesterday announced the inauguration of a 'conservation department,' with Elmer E. Rittenhouse, former president of the Provident Savings Life Assurance Society, at its head. Mr. Rittenhouse will be known as the 'conservation commissioner.'

"The purpose of the new department is to carry into effect one of the new ideas in life insurance, that of conserving the health and lives of present policy holders and preventing lapses. Mr. Rittenhouse attracted wide attention in his former connection by instituting a campaign of medical assistance for policy holders, and recently the Association of Life Insurance Presidents started a health conservation bureau.

"At a meeting this week of the association one of the members reported the results of an inspection he had made of the sanitary conditions of 32 cities of the country, and he suggested the organization of local sanitary clubs.

"The Equitable, however has gone into the matter more extensively. The announcement setting forth the news of the new appointment says:

"All life insurance companies suffer from two sources of waste or loss, which have been given much study and which continue to cost the policy holders large sums annually. One is the annual loss of life from preventable or postponable cause. The other is the loss due to the costly American habit of lapsing policies.

"The life companies of the country lost from this source last year over \$700,000,000 of insurance already on their books, which cost the policy holders of the United States over \$20,000,000 to put on the books. Over 26,000,000 policy holders are therefore personally and financially interested in the reduction of the loss from both these causes.

"The society will assist its members by educational and perhaps other methods to reduce life waste. It will also extend such help as it legally may to the public-health authorities of the country in their efforts to improve sanitary and general health conditions. It will give its moral support to the general life-conservation movement which has reached nation-wide proportions and already accomplished much in favorably affecting the mortality rate of the country.

"This phase of the 'efficiency problem' will be given especial attention and the measures adopted to favorably affect it will be made known as the work develops.

"It is believed that before the end of another five years every life insurance company of consequence will have a department designed not only to conserve business, but to lower mortality. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., of this city, has had great success in its industrial field with its nursing service and the wide distribution of literature setting forth measures to prevent tuberculosis.

"The Equitable, however, will go further than this, according to present plans. It will use its agents and medical men all over the country to cooperate with the local health boards for the purpose of improving sanitary conditions, and it will use the 'conservation department' for the purpose of getting into close touch with individual policy holders."

I respectfully submit an answer to President Huntington, of the Connecticut General Insurance Co., by Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale University, president of the Committee of One Hundred on National Health, on the more obvious benefits a department of health would have over the present Marine-Hospital Bureau:

460 PROSPECT STREET, April 21, 1911.

PRESIDENT ROBERT W. HUNTINGTON, JR.,

Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

DEAR SIR: Senator OWEN has written me that you have inquired of him as to the functions which a new national department of health could profitably assume which are not already sufficiently covered by the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service and the other bureaus of the United States Government.

I think one of the best arguments in favor of such a department is contained in the speech of Senator OWEN himself, which I am therefore sending you under a separate cover. You will notice that his argument shows the utter inadequacy in times of stress of a bureau like the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service under a department the head of which usually does not know and does not care in regard to public health and whose interests, even, are sometimes directly opposed. Except in the life insurance business and some others there is, at least as my studies have led me to believe, a very common conflict between commercial interests and public-health interests. It was for this reason that the yellow fever was systematically concealed in Southern States for fear that its presence would interfere with trade, and it was only as the States there finally appealed to the United States Government to take over the quarantine stations that the intolerable situation by which each locality denied the existence of yellow fever, while accusing the neighboring States of having it, was done away with.

The San Francisco episode is one which Senator OWEN emphasizes. He does not overdraw the situation in the least, as I know by information direct from Dr. John S. Fulton and Dr. J. J. Kinyoun, who were directly concerned, and the former of whom made a special investigation. A number of representatives of San Francisco commercial interests were sent to Washington to prevent the knowledge of the bubonic plague's existence in San Francisco from being spread by the United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, and they would have succeeded had it not been for the fact that Dr. Fulton, then secretary of the board of health of Maryland, had a suit case of documents containing facts on the subject, with which he was able to confront the lies which the delegation from California were trying to spread, simply for the benefit of a few merchants in San Francisco and to the prejudice and danger of the health of the entire country.

I believe that the theme of commercial versus hygienic interests has not been exhausted in Senator OWEN's speech, and that many other instances, equally important, could be given, some of which I am not free to mention, as they have come to me in a more or less confidential manner. Some of these concern the administration of the Bureau of Chemistry in the De-

partment of Agriculture and the Bureau of Animal Industry in regard to meat inspection. With a Department of Agriculture, the main object of which is to improve the prosperity of farmers, including cattle raisers, it is not surprising that the inspection of meats and foods should often be aborted in the interests of the producers, for whom a Department of Agriculture largely exists, but against the much more important interests of the consumers who suffer from the ingestion of deleterious products. I do not believe that those who have not looked into this subject have the faintest conception of the extent to which the public is injured in this matter.

Dr. Wiley, who, in spite of accusations of going to extremes, is certainly a friend of the public interests, is very enthusiastic over the project of having a department of health, and one of his chief arguments is that such a department would afford the only good soil in which bureaus concerned with public health can really grow and flourish. Such bureaus, as long as they are subject to ministers of finance, agriculture, labor, commerce, etc., can never work untrammelled for the public good whenever a conflict of interests exists between the public good and that of the special interests of finance, agriculture, commerce, labor, etc. But the instant we have a department of health, with a secretary whose sworn duty it is to improve the health of the people, that instant we shall have the conditions for the untrammelled exercise of health protection by existing as well as newly created bureaus concerned in public health.

Another great advantage comes from the assembling together of the bureaus now existing and which sometimes work at cross purposes. There would be cooperation instead of duplication, mutual helpfulness and encouragement, and the growth which comes out of these conditions; in other words, economy and efficiency.

There would, I believe, be no need and no probability of duplication of work, as between the national and the State departments of health, any more than there is now a duplication as between the State departments and the municipal departments. The spheres of work of the two would be very different, not only as required by law but also because of the cooperation which would necessarily result. As proof of this we have a precedent in the Department of Agriculture, which has, I believe, never been accused of duplicating the work of the State agricultural experiment stations and colleges, but of helping them. In fact, there are other analogies, as between the United States Army organization and the State militia, which is a relation of mutual helpfulness. This aspect has been formerly considered by Dr. William C. Woodward, health officer of the city of Washington, who could give you more and better instances than occur to me offhand. Suffice it to say that the project for a department of health has been indorsed by the conference of State and Territorial boards of health and by a large number of individual municipal health officers. In fact, I do not know of any local health officers who have opposed a national department of health as duplicating their work. These people are, in general, the most enthusiastic of all for a national department of health, realizing that such a department would give an impetus to the interest in public health which would increase their own power and influence at one bound.

The Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, in its laboratory, has done great work in investigations, and I believe this is self-evidence of how much more could be accomplished if a larger sphere could be given to such investigations. Hookworm and pellagra, though important, are very trifling examples as compared with the results which we might hope for with a larger sphere. The greatest hygienic advances which the world has seen have come out of such department laboratories abroad, particularly the French work of Pasteur, which is the foundation of modern bacteriology, and the German work of Koch, which has done so much for tuberculosis. Proof of what can be done comes from the example of the Department of Agriculture, which has solved the many problems of animal and plant disease by putting experts to work to direct their energies to these specific objects. Some of the best work for public health has been an incidental result, as, for instance, the work of the Bureau of Entomology, under Dr. Howard, which has shown the influence of the typhoid fly, as he calls the common house fly, and as a consequence of which there is a country-wide antityphoid as well as antimosquito crusade.

After a number of years of study of the possibilities of investigation, I am satisfied that there is no subject with which I am at all familiar in which there are so many unexploited possibilities as in public health. For instance, in spite of all the work for improved ventilation and the crusade for outdoor living in connection with the fight against tuberculosis, we do not yet know what are the specific qualities of good as distinct from bad air. The old theory of carbon dioxide has been almost

completely exploded, and we have now simply a great mass of conflicting working hypotheses; as, for instance, that it is the coolness, dryness, humidity, motion, electrification, ionization, ozone condition, freedom from organic impurities, freedom from bacteria, etc., which explains good air as distinct from bad. The instant this problem is solved, the question can be solved with it, and we shall know whether the proper means is to use an ozone machine, humidifier, an electric fan, or some other device.

I do not for a moment doubt that the establishment of a national department of health would lengthen human life very materially, also rapidly, for, besides the above-mentioned advantages, would come a general education of the public. This would take place through bulletins and the use of the public press and in other ways, such as visual exhibits, etc., in a manner similar to the way in which the Department of Agriculture has educated the farmer. A department can do this where a bureau can not, not only because the head would be more sympathetic with such work, but also because a department would have so much more prestige and would attract more attention. The great problem of education of the public consists, I believe, as newspaper men affirm, in getting the ear of the public. It is the large headlines which do the work of molding public opinion, and on the same principle it is a large department rather than a small bureau which will get the public ear. The Department of Agriculture when it was an independent bureau did not have a tithe of the influence which it now possesses.

It is a fact that life has been prolonged or death rates decreased fastest and best where there have been good departments of health. Statistics show that the country of most rapid advance in recent years is Germany, the only country which really has a true department of health. In this country the cities which have good departments of health show the result by a lower death rate, as witness New York, Chicago, and Washington, all of which places have remarkably good health officers. In New York the death rate responded at once to the cleaner streets of Col. Waring, to the improved milk crusade, to the tuberculosis notification law, etc., just as so many cities have responded at once to the introduction of water plants. By the way, Mr. Calvin W. Hendrick, who is putting in a several million dollar new sewerage system in Baltimore, is an enthusiastic advocate of a national department of health in order that it may supply models for municipal sanitation in respect to sewerage systems, etc., believing that in this manner such improvements as he is making in Baltimore could be communicated with great rapidity to other municipalities, which will probably not get these improvements otherwise within a generation. The average "city father" is conservative and will not run to Baltimore or any other city for information when he would take it as a matter of course from a department of health.

As I see it, the situation, in brief, is: First, that there is a great field for hygienic investigation unexploited; second, that the present scientific knowledge is a full generation in advance of its practical application; third, that in order both that knowledge shall increase and that present knowledge shall be applied we need a mechanism like a department of health which, like the Department of Agriculture, will perform the needed investigations and spread the existing knowledge.

I fear I am worrying you. There are many other things I would like to say. I take the liberty of sending with this a copy of my address before the Association of Life Insurance Presidents on the subject of the prolongation of human life, and a copy of a more recent address before the International Association of Accident Underwriters on the same subject. Various insurance associations and companies, including the International Association of Accident Underwriters, have passed resolutions favoring a department of health.

If you have not seen my report to President Roosevelt on National Vitality, and would care to look it over, I should be much pleased to have the opportunity of sending you a copy. Life insurance men are showing a great interest in the subject at present, as you doubtless know. Mr. Messenger, actuary of the Travelers' Life Insurance Co., is one of the Hartford men most interested. President Holcombe, President Dunham, Vice President Linger, and others are also interested.

If I can be of any service to you at any time, I should be very much pleased.

Yours, very sincerely,

Great and organized opposition to the establishment of a department of health has been carried on by a so-called League for Medical Freedom. This league has many good people in it who are misled—Christian Scientists who deny disease, and some good citizens who have been falsely led to believe their liberty

will be invaded—some people who do not think, and some people who have an evil purpose, a sinister commercial purpose, who are engaged in promoting patent medicine. There is a description in Collier's on May 6 and June 3 of this League of Medical Freedom, which is of sufficient interest to justify its being read to the Senate, but without objection I will, Mr. President, insert it in the Record without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall have to object to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. OWEN. I will then proceed to read into the Record this extract. It is as follows:

[From Collier's, May 6, 1911.]

"A BAD BUNCH.

"An octopus which we don't like is the League for Medical Freedom. It is doing a tremendous amount of damage by its opposition to needed medical legislation along all lines relating to the public health throughout the United States. In the excellent California Legislature, for instance, this year, efforts for better sanitary laws were largely blocked by this organization, thoroughly equipped with ready money, and extensive in its hold upon the imaginative minds of many citizens. These gophers have worked underground, since the league came into existence, to counteract the pure food and drugs act of 1906. The membership is composed for the most part of those who were hit hard by the act. Expensive lobbies are maintained at Washington, and in many State capitals, for the purpose of defeating health legislation. In 1909-1911 important bills relating to the health of the Nation were held up in Congress at the instigation of the league. It is alleged that \$25,000 per week was spent by the league lobby. There is probably no accurate way of computing the amounts that have been spent in Washington or at the various State capitals. One method of attack consists in sending showers of telegrams of protest to the Senators and Representatives from all parts of the Union, and especially from the home districts of the lawmakers. These protests are invariably misrepresentations of the real purpose of the proposed legislation. Organizations have been formed in every State of the Union, and attorneys employed to represent the league before conventions, legislative committees, and municipal meetings of all kinds. Another plan of procedure is to send circular letters to delegates of conventions requesting them, in the name of "liberty and fraternity," to vote against any medical resolution that might be introduced. It has always been difficult to get appropriations for health purposes, and if this league continues to fight the health authorities we must expect an increase in the death rate in all States in the next year or two. In Chicago, where the league is strongest, in 1908 the death rate was 14.08 per 1,000 per annum; in 1910 it was 15.21 per 1,000."

I remind the Senate that the chairman of the Committee on Public Health had a thousand telegrams put in his hands on one day, coming through the agents of this so-called League of Medical Freedom, opposing the department of health, although the department of health proposed nothing in the world except the coordination of Federal activities that we already have and putting them together under one intelligent management.

Many citizens telegraphed who thought they would be subjected to compulsory vaccination, who thought their domiciles would be invaded. Many engaged in the art of healing and preventing disease protested under the false assurance that a department of race conservation and of human health meant that they would be denied a license to practice osteopathy, and so forth.

Many protested under the erroneous advice that a department of human conservation of the United States would invade State rights and interfere with local authority. These manufactured telegrams and protests had no genuine foundation of fear. They were manufactured wholesale by sinister commercial forces, that had an unlimited treasury of money, able to organize at once these patent-medicine leagues of medical freedom in many States and flood the press with half-page advertisements in box-car letters.

Collier's answers some of the victimized members of this league who protested against the first editorial, as follows:

[From Collier's, June 3, 1911.]

"LIBERTY.

"Protests from readers have greeted our criticism of the League for Medical Freedom. Also a protest is telegraphed from the California branch of the league. In the minds of most of those who protest the principal objections are to the following positions taken by us: 1. That the league contains the kind of men who opposed the pure-food act. 2. That the activities of

the league are against public welfare and frequently surreptitious. Our answer follows:

"1. B. O. Flower, one of the nine founders of the league, and now in his second term as president of it, was president of 'The R. C. Flower Medicine Co.' from 1885 to 1899. R. C. Flower is the notorious quack and general humbug whose latest arrest was as late as 1908. B. O. Flower wrote the league's pamphlets on Bubonic Plague and The Compulsory Medical Inspection of School Children. His views on patent medicine are often expressed. For instance:

"I believe that a great majority of the proprietary medicines are infinitely less dangerous to the public than the majority of regular doctors' prescriptions.

"2. C. W. Miller, second vice president of the league, was also one of the founders. In his newspaper, which publishes patent medicine advertising, he has constantly fought the medical profession. Last year one of his addresses against what he calls a 'doctors' trust' was delivered to the Dairy Association in Baltimore. We may say in passing that Collier's does not believe in freedom to sell tuberculous milk any more than it does in freedom to sell tuberculous meat.

"3. Mrs. Diana Belais, a director and also a founder, has appeared before in this paper as president of an antiexperiment society, a well-meaning, ignorant, reckless, and muddle-headed agitator. We are officially informed by the chairman of the 'committee on publicity and education' of the league that Mrs. Belais was made a director 'because of her courageous efforts to secure a higher law in New York State than the doctors' cruel theories and professional arrogance.' Here's to antiexperiment, meningitis, diphtheria, and freedom!

"4. Dr. C. S. Carr, who is on the advisory boards, edits a pseudo-medical sheet. Collier's long ago printed a letter signed 'The Peruna Drug Co., per Carr.' As editor of Medical Talk for the Home he carried advertisements of many of the medicines exposed in Collier's in our series on 'The great American fraud.' He is now editor of the Columbus Medical Journal, which he at once turned from an ethical sheet into a sheer fraud. Look at the issue of May, 1909. On the front cover is a picture of Carr himself writing, 'All drugs are poison. All druggists are poisoners.' On the reverse side is an advertisement beginning, 'Prescribe Antikamnia and Codein tablets in la grippe, headaches, etc.' Hurrah for freedom and Peruna!

"5. George P. Englehard, who is on the advisory board, has for a long time in his journal defended the patent-medicine interests.

"6. Charles Huhn, also a member of the board, is a prominent officer in a cooperative patent-medicine concern.

"7. Another founder was a member of the advertising agency which is now spending for the league the money which it puts into its advertising campaigns.

"The league says it did not oppose any 'sanitary or quarantine laws.' This statement requires some hardihood, as the hearings of the Senate Committee on Health, and more especially of the House Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce, show. It would interest us to know whether the league can point out a single health bill introduced in Congress which it has not opposed. When the leaders wish to oppose a sanitary or quarantine law they do it on the ground that such a law would indirectly 'lead to compulsory and discriminatory legislation.'

"The league was nominally born recently, but those who make it up had already as individuals, and even as organizations (such as the Colorado League for Medical Liberty), opposed State and national legislation. A pamphlet published by the Colorado branch singles out Collier's for attack, and was written by a notorious quack doctor. In California, which was the special theme of our former editorial, if the league should prevail, the next threat of bubonic plague would be carried out, instead of being suppressed like the last; smallpox might again become a serious epidemic; school children would bear their ills as best they might. A bill was introduced ordering that the board of health be composed of 2 'allopaths' (a school which does not exist, but is a hostile term for regular physicians), 2 homeopaths, 2 'eclectics,' 2 osteopaths. It did not pass."

"Some leading homeopaths and osteopaths, be it said, are in favor of a national health bureau and strongly against the agitations of the league. Dr. Francis B. Kellogg, president of the California State Homeopathic Society, in an address recently said:

"... In my opinion there is an effort being made to exploit the homeopathic profession by influences and interests which are indirectly but radically opposed to the welfare not only of practitioners of medicine in general, but to that of humanity itself. I refer to the effort to enlist homeopathic support for the so-called National League for Medical Freedom.

"Plato complained that in his day doctors made too sharp a distinction between the body and the mind. In our day the best

class of physicians frequently recommend faith cure and Christian Science, and the Emmanuel movement is an indication that it is possible for science and religion to work together in healing. Few mere observers rate the benefits that Christian Science has brought to the community more highly than we do. A belief which so frequently brings about an actual improvement in character, disposition, bodily health, and mental atmosphere deserves the most serious recognition, even by those who regret its hostility to the progressive science of medicine. It is possible at times for clever designers to use members of any faith for disastrous purposes. When R. C. Flower was at the height of his career, in 1907, as manufacturer of diamonds, vender of fake mining stock, wearer of most ingenious disguises, traveler under assumed names, and general artist in gold bricks, he conceived the idea of playing for profit upon the earnest beliefs of the followers of Mrs. Eddy. One of his accomplices, a woman, who also used an assumed name, worked the game with him, and when Dr. Flower, alias Mr. Cortland, took up the cudgels in defense of Christian Science, without being requested to do so, he said:

"Not that I am one of its disciples, but I like to see everyone free to practice medicine as he wishes.

"Here we have the very words themselves from old Doc Flower. Up with freedom!

"Everybody who believes in 'freedom' in medicine is within his natural and political rights in supporting this league. Collier's, not believing in this species of 'freedom,' is also within its rights in treating the league as a menace, the make-up, bias, and purpose of which ought to be fully understood."

I have a few more editorials from the American Medical Association Journal, which I shall read into the Record for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OWEN. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desired that the Senator from Oklahoma should read the criticisms which he has, because I think it is but fair that the Senate should hear them rather than have them placed in the Record without reading, where we probably never would acquaint ourselves with them.

Mr. OWEN. I think that is probably true.

Mr. GALLINGER. If this so-called League of Medical Freedom is as Collier's pictures it to be, of course it is not worthy of the confidence of anybody. I do not want the Senator or the Senate to think that my objection to having the matter placed in the Record without reading was because I have indorsed that organization, for I know nothing about it, except what the Senator from Oklahoma has now acquainted us with. I would not ask the Senator to read the other articles he has, but would be glad to have him place those in the Record if he so desires.

Mr. OWEN. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, but I prefer to read them.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I want to say that I am not myself a member of the League for Medical Freedom and have no connection with it in any way whatever; but, so far as the members of that league in the State of California are concerned, many of them I know personally, and they are of the very best citizenship of our State; and so far as this article refers to that league in California it is utterly unjust.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I opened my remarks by saying that there were many most excellent people who were members of the League for Medical Freedom, so called, many of who are Christian Scientists, who are osteopaths, who are homeopaths, people for whom I have the highest respect, but this description of this league and its officers by Collier's deals directly with the individuals at the head of this organization and points out who those directors are.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma further yield?

Mr. OWEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. WORKS. But the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma, as well as the comments of the article itself, are not confined to individuals, but are general in their scope.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the membership of this so-called league, in my judgment, have been deliberately misled by sinister interests, and the membership which has been thus added to these alleged rolls of membership has no means of expressing itself. The expression comes through its officers. Those officers are described by Collier's, and I think it would

be well for the membership of that organization to look to the directors and see who they are and understand what is at the bottom of this movement. That is the purpose of my reading into the Record the history of this so-called organization. I shall now read some editorials from the Journal of the American Medical Association:

SOME EDITORIALS FROM THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION—THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION CALLED A TRUST.

"'Trust' is a good word to juggle with nowadays, for to most people it conjures up visions of extortion, robbery, and general oppression. When, therefore, any organization is to be attacked and there are no tangible charges to be preferred against it, it is dubbed a 'trust,' and by that very token is damned in the premises."

I want to say right here that in my State half-page advertisements in huge letters were spread all over that State by this so-called League for Medical Freedom, practically denouncing the medical profession of this country as being a "medical trust," desirous of depriving citizens of their rights to employ any physician they pleased, to use any medicine they pleased, and giving it to be understood that the purpose of a department of health was the invasion of the private home of the citizen and the invasion of the constitutional rights of the State. The members of the so-called League for Medical Freedom have been grossly imposed upon and have been grossly misrepresented as to what they truly stand for. I know what many of their members stand for perfectly well, and I am in accord with them cordially and sincerely. I know what the Christian Scientists stand for, and I sympathize with them; I understand what the osteopaths stand for, too, and I think they serve a good and useful purpose. They have been misled by the agents of the patent medicine association in this country, that are actively engaged in promoting the drug habit in our citizens, and this declaration on the part of the so-called League for Medical Freedom against the American Medical Association is not only unjust and unfair, but it is disgraceful and utterly untrustworthy.

The article continues:

"In this manner the American Medical Association becomes the 'doctors' trust,' according to the 'National League for Medical Freedom' and other organizations with equally high-sounding and misleading names, fathered by the 'patent-medicine' interests. Not that the term originated with this widely advertised 'league,' although some 15 or 16 years ago the president of this 'league' attacked the medical profession in a magazine article on 'Medical monopoly.' The representatives and mouthpieces of the proprietary interests have long employed it; notably Strong, through his two journals, the National Druggist and the Medical Brief, and Engelhard, through his journals, the Western Druggist and the Medical Standard. As the proprietors of these publications are found among the personnel of the 'league' it is natural that this latest 'patent-medicine' organization should have appropriated a figure of speech possessing such magnificent potentialities.

"To the proprietary men the American Medical Association is a trust because, they allege, it has attempted to dictate to physicians what medicinal preparations they shall and shall not use; or, to put it more baldly, because the fraudulency and worthlessness of various proprietary products have been made clear in the Journal. Others have accused the association of being a trust because it has attempted to raise the standard of medical education and thereby to 'control the output of medical students.' But the reason advanced by the 'league' is a brand-new one, invented, no doubt, in the hope that it will reach the public's heart through its most direct route—the purse. The American Medical Association is a trust, we are told, because it has established a schedule of prices by which all its members are bound. The president of the 'league' is reported as saying:

"The [American Medical] Association now fixes the prices charged by physicians in America.

"More specifically the 'league's' vice president puts it:

"The American Medical Association has secured the adoption of its scale of prices throughout the country. * * *

"To such a charge there is but one answer, and that an all-sufficient one, viz, that it is a falsehood, and a stupid one at that. Every physician and every layman who has ever investigated the matter knows that as a matter of fact the American Medical Association has never even suggested that the 'price' of medical service be 'fixed,' but on the contrary has positively discouraged such a proposition. The recommendation in the Principles of Medical Ethics that individual physicians in any locality should adopt some general rules 'relative to the minimum pecuniary acknowledgment from their patients,' has been taken and an attempt made to read into it a meaning never intended and certainly never accepted. What the attitude of

the association is on this point is well set forth in the standard Constitution and By-laws for County Societies, prepared by a committee of the American Medical Association and recommended and very generally adopted by various county societies:

"Sec. 3. Agreements and schedules of fees shall not be made by this society."

"And yet the falsehood is blazoned forth, with a prodigal disregard for the expense entailed, by means of display advertisements and 'interviews,' that the American Medical Association 'fixes the price' of medical service. Of course, the 'league' had to have some shibboleth, and the accusation that the American Medical Association is a 'trust' is an untruth that may be counted on to arouse the interest of the unthinking and to give a more or less plausible excuse for the 'league's' existence. How absurdly mendacious the accusation is the medical profession already knows and the public will not be long in learning."

"Again we say: The publicity which the 'patent-medicine' interests are giving to the American Medical Association through this 'league' is welcomed. The more the people know about the association and the work it is doing, the keener the investigation made of its methods and aims, the better it will be not only for the American Medical Association and the medical profession of the country, but also, more important than all, for the public itself." (Editorial, Journal American Medical Association.)

Mr. President, the American Medical Association has published at great length scientific and careful analyses of most of the nostrums and patent-medicine frauds of this country. They have given wide publicity to it, and in that way they have excited the violent animosity and hostility of the patent-medicine people, so that the declaration is made by them that the medical profession comprises a trust. In point of fact, if the American Medical Society form a trust and if they are concerned in establishing a department of health with a view to preventing sickness, which would be the purpose of a department of health, they would be engaged in tearing down their own business; they would be engaged in depriving themselves of their patients from whom they make their living. It would be the only trust in existence which is concerned in diminishing its own revenues and destroying its own financial foundation. Such a trust as that is a very novel trust and one that deserves encouragement.

Now, Mr. President, without further objection, I will submit for printing in the Record the concluding editorials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A NEW COMBINATION AGAINST THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

"Within the past few days the newspapers of the chief cities of the country have carried large advertisements headed, 'Do you want the "Doctors' Trust" to be able to force its opinions on you?' These advertisements paint in vivid colors—'yellow' predominating—the disaster and general destruction that will follow the formation of a Federal department of health. They emanate from, or, to be more correct, are signed by, an organization calling itself the 'National League for Medical Freedom.' In addition to the regular display advertisements the press agent is supplying matter for the reading pages, and there is every evidence that the propaganda is not lacking financial support. Of course, the American Medical Association is the *bête noire* the 'league' seeks to kill; it is the 'Medical Trust' referred to. Members of the association will be surprised to learn that if a national department of health is created it will result in 'denying to the people the right to determine for themselves the kind of medical treatment they shall employ.' For this reason, and so far as the advertisements state, for this reason only, the National League for Medical Freedom has been brought into being. As a slogan, under which the real reasons for organizing may be carefully concealed, it may serve its purpose. Most people prefer to have their thinking done for them, and this alone will prevent the absurdity of such a proposition as that on which the 'league' is ostensibly founded becoming apparent. Yet every person with the most elemental knowledge of our Government knows that the regulation of the practice of medicine and the licensing of physicians is a function of the State, and that any law attempting to confer such power on a department of the Federal Government would be unconstitutional. The proposed department of health would have just as much authority to determine what 'kind of medical treatment' the people should employ as the Department of Agriculture has to dictate to the farmer regarding the implement company he shall buy his plows of. Yet we are asked to believe, apparently, that a national department of health would mean that the free-born American citizen who wanted to have a purulent appendix cured by the 'spinal adjustment' route would have to patronize

a surgeon, even though he were a 'conscientious objector' to surgery. It would mean, it seems, that the individual suffering from malaria who wished to be freed from this 'moral error' by 'absent treatment' would be ignominiously dragged to the internist and dosed with quinine. It would mean that the optimist who would cure his rheumatism by wearing a 'guaranteed magnetic ring' would have to endure the administration of the salicylates. It would mean—but why pursue these harrowing predictions further?

"Seriously, though, there must be something wrong with the mental make-up of the individuals composing this 'league' who expect—even by such potent means as the lavish distribution of printer's ink—to persuade a reasonably sane people that any law might, could, or would be enacted that would curtail the rights of the public as they have suggested. Of course, the fact is that the moving spirits behind the organization of the 'league' have neither an overwhelming solicitude for the public welfare nor any strenuous objection to the formation of a national department of health. The 'league's' actual, and fairly evident, *raison d'être* is opposition to and antagonism against the American Medical Association. To disclose the source of this opposition it is only necessary to call attention to some of the members of the 'advisory board'—high-sounding title—as reported in the newspapers, to make reasonably clear to the members of the American Medical Association the 'power behind' the 'league.' The publisher of the Medical Standard and Western Druggist, for instance, has long been known as a defender of, and mouthpiece for the 'patent medicine' and proprietary interests. His presence on the 'advisory board' is fitting, and the only surprising thing about it is that he should have been guilty of such a tactical blunder as getting into the fierce light of publicity.

"That the president of the American Druggists' Syndicate should be on the 'board' was to be looked for, and being looked for, is found. And there are others! Among the lesser satellites in this distinguished galaxy are those who very naturally might be expected to enter enthusiastically into such a campaign—the president of an antivivisection society, some 'mental healers' and one or two journalists of varying degrees of obscurity. Of the latter, one has for years been strongly opposed to medical organization and more recently has taken up that mental vagary known as 'new thought.' Taking into consideration both the objects of the 'league' and the personnel of its 'board' one feels that the New York Journal expressed only a half truth when it said:

"The druggists and the proprietary medicine interests throughout the country are said to be chiefly concerned in defeating the Owen bill."

"It would have been nearer the facts if for 'defeating the Owen bill' were substituted the clause 'attempting to disrupt the American Medical Association.' A dozen years ago the public might not have been able to see the animus prompting this attack; to-day it is wiser.

"As to the publicity which this sensational and costly campaign will give to the American Medical Association, the medical profession may welcome it. One thing that has long been needed is that of directing the attention of the laity to the aims and accomplishments of the American Medical Association. It welcomes investigation; the more the public learns about the work the association is doing the better for the association. It has nothing to be ashamed of, but it has a great deal to be proud of; its work in the interests of both public welfare and scientific medicine is and always has been open and aboveboard. The association needs no defense; it is not only well able to stand on its record, but is proud of that record." (Editorial, Journal American Medical Association.)

"NATIONAL CONSERVATION CONGRESS AND A DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH."

"The National Conservation Congress, recently in session in St. Paul adopted a platform setting forth the views of the delegates as to the duty of the Federal and State Governments in conserving the natural and vital resources of the Nation. One of the planks, unanimously adopted by the committee on resolutions and later by the convention itself, indorsed in no uncertain terms the establishment of a department of health. This plank read: 'We also recommend that in order to make better provision for preserving the health of the Nation a department of public health be established by the National Government.' This declaration was adopted in spite of a large amount of carefully stimulated (and simulated) opposition. The plank was introduced before the committee on resolutions by a delegate from Pennsylvania. As soon as it was known that there was likelihood of its adoption telegrams from all over the country began to pour in on the members of the committee on resolutions, requesting, urging, and demanding that no action be taken on this subject. On Thursday morning, when the delegates assembled in the auditorium, there was found on each seat a marked

copy of the Pioneer Press containing a full-length, two-column 'appeal' (otherwise known as advertising matter) from the National League for Medical Freedom, reiterating previously made statements regarding 'political doctors,' 'medical trust,' 'interference with liberty,' and other stock bugbears. But, as a reporter for the Pioneer Press said, 'the delegates smiled.' The men composing the convention, who had been sent to St. Paul to represent the interests of the people and not the people of the interests, who had been able to detect the cloven hoof of monopoly under the specious plea for 'State rights' which had been made in the opening days of the convention, were not slow to understand who and what were the influences back of the objections to governmental action for the saving of life. 'The delegates smiled' when they received the telegrams, when they adopted the resolution of the committee and when the unanimous vote of the convention approved the platform. It was the sound judgment and common sense of the average American citizen which led the delegates to realize that health and life are important and that the only men who oppose any means by which life can be saved are those who have a selfish and mercenary interest in perpetuating present conditions." (Editorial, Journal American Medical Association.)

"WHO PAYS THE BILLS?"

"Newspaper men are not easily misled as to motives, neither are they slow to recognize the real forces behind an effort to influence public sentiment. An editorial in a recent number of the Baltimore Evening Sun shows how the better class of newspaper editors regard the strenuous and well-nigh hysterical efforts now being made to simulate a popular uprising against the awful iniquity of national health legislation.

"As the Sun well says, the mere statement of the arguments of the National League for Medical Freedom is all the answer that is necessary. But the attack on the Owen bill is only a pretext. The American Medical Association is the real target. The forces behind this movement are endeavoring to take advantage of the popular feeling against trusts and monopolies by branding the American Medical Association as a 'doctors' trust,' a designation, by the way, which originated with certain so-called medical journals which derived their support from nostrum vendors.

"Evidently, the manufacturers of 'baby killers,' sophisticated and adulterated foodstuffs, cheap and bad whiskies under the guise of 'family remedies,' and fakirs and swindlers doing business under the guise of physicians, hope that the American public and press will accept this designation without asking for proof or evidence, and that by such methods the American Medical Association and its work can be discredited in the public estimation. 'The delegates smiled' when the members of the committee on resolutions, at the Conservation Congress at St. Paul, were overwhelmed with a flood of telegrams carefully arranged for beforehand, protesting against the indorsement of a national department of health. Truly, newspaper editors and managers must smile with equal persistency when 'copy' is received for half-page advertisements at a daily cost of \$25,000, denouncing the national organization of the medical profession as a 'doctors' trust.' Newspaper men know the cost of a general advertising campaign. They also know that only those who are financially and mercenarily interested in blocking the work which the American Medical Association is doing, and who fear to have any further light thrown on their nefarious doings, would furnish the money for such an extensive and expensive advertising campaign. The National League for Medical Freedom asks no dues of its 'members,' yet it has used large quantities of the most expensive newspaper advertising space. Who pays the bills, and whence comes all the money?

"Certainly it does not come from the few homeopaths who have joined the league, nor from the few eclectics, nor from the small number of osteopaths; and surely the Christian Scientists are not shouldering this enormous burden. The obvious conclusion is that the money comes from those exploiters of human weakness and credulity whose fraudulent practices have been exposed by the American Medical Association, and whose pocketbooks have been injured in consequence." (Editorial, Journal American Medical Association.)

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, out of order, I ask leave to offer a proposed amendment to the so-called free-list bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator ask to have it printed and lie upon the table?

Mr. CLAPP. I ask that it be printed and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I had hoped to submit a few views upon the question pending before the Senate—

the amendment to the paper section of the reciprocity bill—but I do not care to do so this afternoon, inasmuch as the Senators to whom I wish to particularly address my remarks seem to have very little interest in the matter.

I favor the amendment and believe that I have more confidence in its adoption than apparently the author of the amendment has. If I can do anything to secure favorable action by the Senate, I desire to have the opportunity to do so; but, as I have said, I do not care to take up the time of the Senate when there are those absent to whom I wish particularly to address myself.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not understand to what amendment the Senator referred when he said he was in favor of it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The so-called Root amendment to the Canadian reciprocity bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought the Senator was talking about the free-list bill in connection with the amendment just submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], and the statement was interesting to me in that way.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I do not know what amendment the Senator refers to.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said I thought the Senator referred to the free-list bill in connection with the amendment just offered by the Senator from Minnesota to that bill.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I do not understand that the amendment sent to the desk by the Senator from Minnesota is now pending. I understand the pending question to be on the amendment of which the Senator from New York [Mr. Root] is the author and which has been reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SIMMONS. I entirely misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. In accordance with the suggestion I have made, Mr. President, I shall withhold what I have to say; but if at any time I do take up the matter, I will attempt to do so on Monday next before the amendment is voted on.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. BAILEY and Mr. CLAPP addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah withhold his motion?

Mr. SMOOT. I withhold the motion.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I desire to present an amendment which at the proper time I intend to offer to the pending reciprocity bill as a separate and independent section. I ask that the amendment be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 26, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, June 24, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, above all, through all, and in all, to quicken, to inspire, to guide, amid the conflicting elements, the profound problems, the strenuous duties which appeal to every serious, strong-minded, noble-hearted man, we thank Thee for the special order of the day in memory of such a man who met life and its problems with the courage and fortitude of a great soul and distinguished himself wherever he was called to serve—on the field of battle, at the bar of justice, in the legislative halls of State and Nation. Quick to perceive, clear of judgment, wise in counsel, strong in action, eloquent of speech, a leader of men; patient, gentle, easy of approach, a friend of the friendless, a follower of the King of men; respected, honored, loved by all who knew him; called from a life of usefulness with a character full, rounded out, a passport to the realms of eternal life; we thank Thee for what he was and for what he did, and we pray that his example may inspire us and those who shall come after us to earnest endeavor and purity of purpose. Be graciously near to all who mourn him, especially the bereaved wife and children, to uphold, sustain, and comfort them in the blessed promises of